DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 377 SO 011 355

AUTHOR	Register, Cheri; And Others
TITLE	The Women's Studies Senior Seminar 1976-77.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Women's Studies Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Council on Liberal Education Small Grants Program.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	169p.; Not available in hard copy from EDRS due to various changes in ink density and small type print of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Anthropology; Behavioral Sciences; *Course Content; Course Descriptions; *Course Evaluation; *Course Objectives; Grants; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Literature; Psychology; Social Sciences; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Interests; Student Projects; Tables (Data); *Team Teaching; Womens Education; *Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper describes and evaluates two courses comprising a senior seminar designed as the culmination of a women's studies curriculum. Interdisciplinary in nature and team-taught, the seminar included studies from the fields of literature, psychology, and anthropology. The theme of the Winter 1977 course was "Women, Culture, and Power." Lectures included an analysis of the process by which theories are constructed in science and the social sciences, Jungian psychology, and biases and problems in the behavioral and social sciences. Readings were critical and theoretical in nature (i.e., Rosaldo and Lamphere, "Women, Culture and Society"). During the second course, students executed individual projects and met weekly to discuss Simone deBeauvoir's "The Second Sex." The final three weeks were devoted to oral presentations. The summary of student evaluations includes background information on students and describes the aspects of courses and instruction on which the students commented. The summary and evaluation reveal that during the first course students were confused, critical, and even hostile toward the readings, instructors, and lectures. However, the evaluation of the second course by students was much better because of its direct application to student goals. Recommendations, based on identified problems and evaluations, for designing and conducting similar seminars are given. The appendices, which form the bulk of the document, include a copy of the grant proposal for developing the course, syllabi and handouts, abstracts of student projects, student profiles, and evaluations. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164377

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gayle Graham
Yates
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

THE WOMEN'S STUDIES
SENIOR SEMINAR
1976-77

A Description and Evaluation of an Experiment Supported by a Grant from the University of Minnesota Council on Liberal Education Small Grants Program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cheri Register
Jennette Jones
Barbara (Dewald) Noble
Patricia S. Faunce

50-011355

c. 1978

Women's Studies Program
492 Ford Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minn. 55455

CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION AND HISTORY 1

II. COURSE STRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION WINTER QUARTER 1977 5

III. COURSE STRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION SPRING QUARTER 1977 11

IV. RESULTS OF STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS 15

V. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION 27

APPENDIX

A. GRANT PROPOSALS

B. COURSE SYLLABUS AND HANDOUTS

C. ABSTRACTS OF STUDENTS PROJECTS

D. STUDENT PROFILES

E. STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND HISTORY

The University of Minnesota Women's Studies Program was established in 1973 and began offering courses that fall. It became a B.A. degree-granting program at the start of the academic year 1975-76. One component of the Women's Studies major curriculum was a three-quarter sequence of Senior Seminars, designed as the culmination of the Women's Studies majors' academic experience. The intention of the seminars, as expressed in the Program's brochure, was to "allow students to direct knowledge and methodology gained from courses and experience toward topics of an interdisciplinary nature with a focus on women."

Although graduating seniors in the Program were required to complete twelve credits (three quarters) of Senior Seminar work, the budget for that first year did not cover the expenses of a full curriculum. Consequently, the first quarter of the Senior Seminar was conducted on overload by the staff of the Women's Studies Program: Toni McNaron, Coordinator; Judy Wanhala, Administrative Assistant and Program Advisor; and Etta Magnusen, Directed Studies Advisor. It consisted of common readings and discussions conducted weekly in an informal setting--often off campus--in late afternoon or early evening. One benefit of this arrangement was that it brought students and staff into closer contact with each other and allowed for a more egalitarian exchange of interests and ideas than is generally achieved in the classroom.

During fall quarter of 1975, there was some discussion among faculty, students, and others interested in the Women's Studies Program about the necessity of developing a coherent, definable "feminist perspective" as the feature which distinguishes women's studies, an interdisciplinary field, from the often sexist studies of women done in the traditional disciplines. The Senior Seminar was suggested as an appropriate forum for resolving the question "What is a feminist perspective?" At the same time, money became available to hire a teacher for the winter and spring quarter seminars. Cheri Register, a recent Ph.D. who had written a dissertation on feminist literary criticism and had taught in the Scandinavian Department the previous year as a sabbatical replacement, was hired by the Women's Studies Program specifically to teach the Senior Seminar. Since Register had already made plans for a research trip to Sweden in the spring, McNaron agreed to conduct a seminar on "Woman as Other" as part of her regular teaching load.

Register's seminar was entitled "Feminism in Academe" and was primarily a methods course. The syllabus listed four objectives:

1. To define a feminist approach to the fields of study (disciplines) represented by the members of the class.
2. To examine how methodologies used in academic research in-

fluence the outcome of that research--in other words, to look critically at the ways "knowledge" is obtained rather than accepting it at face value.

3. To investigate some methodologies currently in use to see whether they are compatible with a feminist approach.
4. Finally, to help make it possible for women--and feminists--to survive in academe without denying our own experiences and perceptions and compromising our interests.

The first two weeks of the course, which met twice weekly, were devoted to discussion of the class members' experiences as women in the academic world and of their reasons for pursuing women's studies. The students were asked to make some general, preliminary definitions of concepts like "feminism" and "women's studies" and to list basic principles that a feminist methodology ought to adhere to. The combined lists of principles were referred to and amended throughout the quarter, in hopes that the class would achieve a consensus about the meaning of "feminist perspective," or at least be able to identify the major disagreements.

Next, each of the twelve students was asked to make an oral presentation on methodological developments in feminist research in a particular discipline. Since almost all of the students were, in effect, double majors (e.g. Women's Studies and Psychology, Women's Studies and English), most of them chose to look at their other field. Others looked ahead to graduate or professional school or chose an issue, such as women's sexuality, rather than a discipline. Thus, the class as a whole was given a rather broad survey of women's studies as a developing field.

Finally, the students were divided into three teams and assigned the task of learning about a particular ideology, world-view, or orientation that has had some impact upon women's studies--particularly on the way in which questions are asked and data are selected and interpreted. The three orientations studied were Marxist, psychoanalytic (both Freudian and Jungian), and the "Human Potential Movement," including transactional analysis, assertiveness training, and other current forms of practical psychology and behavioral change. The results of the team investigations were also presented as oral reports.

As a final written assignment, each student was asked to prepare a brief proposal for a project addressing the subject of motherhood, in which she would outline a method, drawing upon material covered in the course.

While this course was underway, the Women's Studies Committee[1] began looking ahead to the curricular requirements for the next year. The opening sequence of the three-quarter Senior Seminar fell short of the ideal, due to limitations of staff and budget. It was felt that advance planning for the second year should be very careful and deliberate, and that an additional source of funds should be sought. One option suggested was to apply to the University's Center for Educational Development for an Educational Development Grant to improve upon and stabilize the Senior Seminar sequence, building it around the concept of a methods course. While Register's course design was judged basically sound, one obvious drawback was that a single teacher was expected to advise and evaluate students doing work in several disciplines. Team-teaching was suggested as a more effective and academically credible way of conducting such a seminar.

---

[1] The Women's Studies Program is governed by a committee of faculty and staff from throughout the College of Liberal Arts appointed by the Dean of the College.

The Curriculum and Personnel Subcommittee of the Women's Studies Committee had already issued an appeal for course proposals from people interested in teaching in the Program the following year. Three people, in addition to Register, had expressed interest in conducting a segment of the Senior Seminar: Patricia Faunce, an Associate Professor of Psychology and the Director of the Measurement Services Center, who was also chairing the Curriculum and Personnel Subcommittee; Barbara Dewald, a graduate student in anthropology; and Jennette Jones, a graduate student in anthropology who was currently teaching a Women's Studies topics course on "Women in Myth and Ritual." These four people, then, became the proposed team of teachers for the coming year's seminar, and the course was to be designed around their areas of competence. Some benefit was also seen in retaining the notion of the Senior Seminar as a forum for the students and the core staff of the Women's Studies Program to work together as scholars. Therefore, the staff was asked to conduct the fall quarter of the seminar. Wanhala, Magnusen, and Gayle Graham Yates, who would be replacing Toni McNaron as Women's Studies Coordinator, all agreed to do this on a weekly basis, as an overload assignment.

In February of 1976, a grant request for $11,909 was submitted to the Center for Educational Development (see proposal in Appendix A.) This would cover the teachers' salaries and the expenses of planning, conducting, and evaluating the winter and spring quarters of the Senior Seminar. The proposal was returned with instructions to trim it. A revised proposal for planning and evaluating only was submitted, with a request for $3,050. (Appendix A) On June 9, the Center for Educational Development announced that it would award $2,850. (See letter in Appendix A.)

Thus, a shift in the original plan had to be made. Cheri Register was hired half-time on the regular Women's Studies budget as "primary teacher" or seminar coordinator. Pat Faunce, who was already employed full-time by the University, offered to participate on an overload basis. Barbara Dewald and Jennette Jones could be paid only a limited honorarium. Nevertheless, they volunteered time for the remainder of the course, so that the team-teaching aspect of the plan would not be sacrificed.

During the fall quarter, the senior majors met weekly with Yates, Wanhala, and Magnusen for an introduction to the concept "feminist perspective." Three disciplines--literature, history, and counseling/therapy--were chosen to illustrate how a feminist perspective is applied in research and practice. In addition, the course provided an introduction to resources available in the University libraries and at the Social Welfare History Archives. (See course outline in Appendix B.)

At the same time, the teaching team for winter and spring quarters was meeting weekly to plan the course format, divide responsibilities, and select materials. On January 3, 1977, the funded, experimental portion of the seminar got underway. The actual structure and classroom format of the winter and spring quarters of the Women's Studies Senior Seminar for 1977 are described in the following two chapters.

CHAPTER II

COURSE STRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION

WINTER QUARTER 1977

Introduction

The first quarter of the Senior Seminar had several basic objectives: to present critically a number of methodological approaches to the study of women; to acquaint the students with the basic concepts and typical sexist biases which characterize a number of academic disciplines (literature, psychology, and anthropology in particular); and to help the students develop individual research projects based on a unifying theme selected by the class. A final goal, which went beyond the pedagogical aims of the seminar, was to bring together various feminist methodologies into a general system.

Planning

Much of the preliminary planning was done by the coordinator, Cheri Register, based on her experience with the seminar she had taught the preceding year. The four instructors worked together in several intensive planning sessions during the late summer and the fall of 1976. During these sessions we discussed some basic assumptions and definitions (such as the distinction between "feminine" and "feminist"), and prepared glossaries of basic terms in the several disciplines for our own and students' reference. A preliminary course outline was agreed upon, a class calendar was prepared, and each instructor completed a bibliography of required readings and indicated the general nature of the assignments which she would require. (The final forms of these are included in Appendix B.)

Faculty responsibilities were discussed at this time, and the instructors agreed that lecturing, conducting and participating in classroom discussions, and advising students would be shared approximately equally. Each instructor was to have primary responsibility for grading the short papers which she assigned. However, the bulk of the administrative details would fall to the coordinator.

Format and Content

During winter quarter the seminar met twice a week for ten weeks, Tuesday and Thursday from 11:15 to 12:30. A course calendar was distributed to the students during the first week of class, and this provided the basic framework for the class sessions, with minor alterations due to instructors' illness.

During the first week of class, Register presented a general introduction to the goals and format of the seminar. Students discussed their own personal and professional goals for the course and expressed some of their dissatisfactions with the course format of the Senior Seminar during fall quarter. Many felt that there was not sufficient opportunity for input from the students during fall quarter and that their responsibilities in the course were not altogether clear. Students also wrote a list of principles which they thought a feminist methodology ought to adhere to and suggested possible themes for the spring research project. These were voted on during the second week of class, and "Women, Culture, and Power" was chosen as the unifying theme.

During the second through ninth weeks of the course, the four instructors alternated in presenting various topics through lecture and discussion. Discussions ranged from highly academic to personal, and at times involved all of the instructors as well as the students.

Dewald led off with a lecture on basic assumptions which characterize scientific research and followed with an analysis of the process by which theories are constructed in science and the social sciences. One of the questions dealt with in class discussion was whether propositions or ways of knowing are ever gender-free. Dewald concluded with a discussion of two studies of the matrifocal black family in America, illustrating the way in which theoretical assumptions (about sex roles, in this case) may affect research conclusions.

One session during the third week was devoted to a general discussion of the goals and format of the Senior Seminar. This was in response to concerns about the course expressed by several students. (See Chapter V.)

During the fourth week, Jones lectured on basic anthropological approaches to the study of culture as these relate to the understanding of women. Emphasis was on recent feminist research employing the method of cross-cultural comparison for testing hypotheses about women. Students wrote a short paper comparing two or more anthropological studies of women. The topic of "women in field research" was dropped from class discussion due to lack of time.

The fifth week of class was devoted to literary criticism. During the first session Register introduced methods of criticism currently in use and evaluated their applicability to literature by and about women. The second session had a more personal and practical focus. Each student was asked to describe how she selects and responds to literature, and to speculate about how feminist criticism might aid in her understanding and appreciation of literature. In preparation for this, the students filled out a questionnaire about their reading habits and wrote a short paper on feminist literary criticism.

Jungian psychology and its application to the feminist movement were introduced by Jones during the next two sessions. Students took a "Jungian Type Test" and wrote short papers. The archetype of "the feminine," pro and con, and the concept of androgyny were emphasized.

The following week Register conducted a discussion on academic Marxism and Marxist-feminist methodology, and students wrote a short paper applying the latter to their own up coming projects. Two students who belong to a Marxist study group reported on their experience, and class discussion focused on the relation between Marxist (class-oriented) and feminist (sex-oriented) approaches to social problems.

During the following two weeks Faunce led discussions on various topics related to biases and problems in the behavioral and social sciences. She began with a brief historical summary of psychology, and discussed the modern fields (personality psychology, social, and developmental) which are relevant to the study of women. Freudian psychology was also discussed briefly. A major theme of lectures and discussions was the tendency of psychologists and psychoanalysts to equate "humanness" with "maleness" in their basic assumptions and in the interpretation of results. Recent research on the psychology of women, designed to eliminate or minimize sex biases, was covered in readings and discussion, and students wrote a paper summarizing the articles read.

During the final week of classes each student turned in a research proposal for spring quarter, plus a one-paragraph abstract. These were read by all the instructors and returned with comments.

Readings

No single text or group of texts on methodology was sufficiently broad for the purposes of the Senior Seminar. Therefore, readings were selected by each instructor to serve as background for the topics which she presented in class. The readings, which included books, excerpted chapters or sections of books, journal articles, and unpublished papers, dealt with the following general topics:

1. The Sociology of Science
2. The Anthropology of Women; Field Research
3. Methods of Literary Criticism; Feminist Literary Criticism
4. Jungian Psychology and Women
5. Academic Marxism; Marxist-Feminist Methodology
6. Biases and Problems in the Behavioral and Social Sciences

(Bibliographies of required and supplemental readings are included in Appendix B.)

Since many of the excerpts and articles used are not readily available, reprints were provided. Assignments were made on a weekly basis, so that readings provided background for the topics covered in class and also served as resource material for short papers.

The reading materials were eclectic not only in subject matter but also in theoretical orientation. Most of the readings, however, fall into the following four categories, some of which are overlapping:

1. Theoretical overviews of a particular field of study. Geertz's "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture" is a theoretical article emphasizing the importance for interpretive anthropology of "thick" description (i.e. particularistic, objectively detailed) which permits generalizations not across cultural cases but within them. Another example, Tom Bottomore's Karl Marx, is a collection of twelve essays by various authors dealing with basic aspects of Marxist theory. Topics include class consciousness, the state, the proletariat, and historical materialsim.

2. Methodological and theoretical approaches which are not specifically feminist, presented for critical review. Most of the essays

on Jungian psychology, including those in Man and His Symbols, fall under this heading, as they present an archetypal view of "the feminine" which is highly controversial from a feminist point of view. The essays on Marx in Bottomore's collection are also open to criticism in their presentation of an implicityly sexist view of society, although in this text women suffer more by omission than by biased interpretation.

3. Feminist critiques of sex-biased studies. Almost all the articles in the bibliography for the behavioral and social sciences fall into this category, since academic psychology is a field characterized by a long history of sexist bias, and a short but highly productive history of feminist revisions of the psychology of women. Some of the articles on feminist literary criticism also incorporate critiques of earlier sex-biased approaches. A dominant theme in the former is the importance of women's literature for the women's movement.

4. Examples of original research from a feminist point of view. Rosaldo and Lamphere's Women, Culture and Society contains a number of general theoretical articles on the anthropology of women, plus recent cross-cultural research relating women's social power to ideology, to forms of domestic organization, and to economic participation. Some of the articles on literary criticism fall under this heading, as do some of the articles employing a Marxist-feminist approach.

Written Assignments

In addition to the required readings, which were assigned by individual instructors on a weekly basis, the students prepared three kinds of written assignments:

1. Informal assignments. Students were occasionally asked to put various ideas into writing such as "principles which a feminist methodology ought to adhere to" or "suggested themes for spring quarter." These were commented on, but not graded.

2. Short papers based on the readings. These were two to five pages in length. Topics were assigned by the individual instructors, who also commented on the papers and assigned grades. (A list of these topics is included in Appendix B.)

3. The project proposal. This was a short (three or four page) prospective statement of research to be carried out during the spring quarter. A one paragraph abstract of the proposal was also required, to be dittoed and handed out to the rest of the class. Both of these were due the last week of class winter quarter and were expected to conform to a list of guidelines for writing the proposal which the teachers had handed out. (See Appendix B.) One value of the project proposal is that it exposed a number of potential problems in the early stages. Chief among these were the choice of topics which were too large in scope, vagueness as to research methods, and inadequate background information. The proposals were read and commented on by each of the four instructors and returned to the students for revisions, additions, or in some cases a complete reworking of the original idea. The revised proposals were turned in during the first week of class by all the students who continued into spring quarter.

Grading

At the end of winter quarter, students were given the option of receiving a letter grade based on the quarter's work, or taking an in progress grade of "X" for winter quarter, with work from winter and spring quarters averaged out at the end of the year. Nine students chose the in progress option. Four students elected to receive a letter grade at the end of winter quarter. This grade, assigned by the course coordinator, was the average of all the graded written assignments by that student, that is, the short papers and the course proposal.

CHAPTER III

COURSE STRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION

SPRING QUARTER 1977

Introduction

The second quarter of the Senior Seminar was designed principally to allow students to execute the research proposed during winter quarter. As students worked individually on projects the first six weeks of spring quarter, they also met as a group once a week to share problems and discuss Simone de Beauvoir's The Second Sex. These activities kept students in touch with each other and provided a minimal but important structure. For the final three weeks, the group met to hear oral presentations of topics.

Planning

Late in winter quarter, the instructors met to plan details of the spring seminar. During fall quarter planning sessions we had determined only that the emphasis in spring would be on conducting research, but had not formulated any specific plans for group meetings. In developing the spring curriculum, we attempted to solve problems that had arisen in winter in addition to providing students with a useful seminar experience. A number of actual and potential difficulties, listed below, were discussed.

1. The course was somewhat unfocussed in winter quarter, due to the diversity of topics covered by individual instructors.
2. Students were frustrated by their lack of input into both the planning and conducting of the seminar fall and winter quarters.
3. Many students felt that the subject matter of the winter seminar was too abstract and far removed from their own feminist concerns.
4. In spring, students would not have a common subject, but instead would be working on research topics in many different disciplines. Once again, it would be difficult to keep the course focussed.
5. Class meetings toward the end of the quarter would necessarily be more numerous and intense as students gave their presentations, than at the beginning, when they would be working independently.

In setting up the spring course, we attempted to remedy all these problems.

Format

For the first six weeks of spring quarter, the class met once a week on Thursdays, from 11:15 until 12:30.

At the beginning of each session, students were asked to share their experiences--either difficulties or successes--conducting research. Our intent was to provide a supportive situation in which students could gauge their own progress. We felt this would be particularly important for students doing their first major project.

Following this exchange of experiences, two or three students facilitated a discussion of The Second Sex. Their responsibilities were to raise important issues and questions and to keep the discussion reasonably well focussed on the material.

The last four weeks of class were devoted to student research presentations. For this period, Tuesdays from 11:15 until 12:30 were added to the weekly schedule. Two students per class period were to give presentations.

Readings

In planning the spring seminar, it became clear that it would be useful to have at least one activity common to the whole class. A reading of de Beauvoir's The Second Sex was suggested as the central activity, for several reasons: Obviously, it provided a "text" for the group to focus on. Many of the issues de Beauvoir covers were related to the theme of the seminar, "Women, Culture and Power." The Second Sex is one of the great, often unread, classics of the modern women's movement and de Beauvoir herself one of its "foremothers."

The Second Sex presents an interpretation of the status of women rooted in the ideas of French existentialist philosophy. Her analysis considers the "female experience" in light of theories from biology, anthropology, psychology, and history. Additionally, she uses data gathered informally from European and American women to describe common experiences of women in industrialized countries.

Early on, de Beauvoir's book provided students with a context for discussing their own experiences as women. In sharing experiences familiar to all, common ground was established and discussions focussed more closely on the text itself. We did not, in the six weeks, do an exhaustive reading of this very difficult book. However, we all received a useful introduction to a second reading. Our original purpose for the book also was fulfilled, in that it drew the seminar together.

Assignments

Students were given four assignments: (1) To read The Second Sex and conduct a discussion session. (2) To make an oral presentation of the final project. (3) To write a final paper based on independent research. (4) To write evaluations of all presentations--discussion leading and research projects--made in class, including self-evaluations.

1. Leading discussion section. During the first meeting of the quarter, students signed up for a day of discussion leading. The text was divided into roughly equal parts, with two or three students assigned to each part.

Students met outside class to plan the sessions. They were encouraged to use the theme of "Women, Culture and Power" as a focus for discussion, but beyond that broad guideline, were free to organize the session as they wanted.

The assignment involved reading the week's section, preparing an outline of the material, and leading the discussion by raising important issues and questions.

In preparing to facilitate discussion, many students had difficulty with the text, which is dense and complicated. One group of facilitators used a particularly helpful strategy: They provided the class with a written summary of each section of the reading, including questions for discussion and a list of unfamiliar or controversial terms. (See Appendix B.)

2. Oral Presentation. An important part of the final project was the oral presentation. Beginning the seventh week of classes, students presented the results of their work. They had written proposals on a wide variety of topics: prostitution; health care and the women's self-help movement; spirituality; feminist art collectives; the wedding industry; female offenders and the criminal justice system; childbirth; Virginia Woolf's Orlando; women's music.

In conception, the presentations were to be informal versions of material going into the final paper. It was expected that, by the date of presentation, all major work would be completed, with only loose ends to tie up. Although we expected that early reports might be less polished than late ones, that did not prove to be so. The first report, on female offenders and the criminal justice system, was one of the most effective.

Most students had approximately 35 minutes for their presentations. Because of last-minute schedule changes, two students used a full class period to present their work. In terms of effectiveness of the oral presentations, these students had a slight structural advantage over others with shorter times. Students tended not to organize their presentations to fit the alloted time, but rather to telescope the work, and as a result, were often rushed at the end.

In most presentations, time was reserved at the end for students to discuss the project, ask questions, and make suggestions for changes.

3. Final Paper. The final paper, due during the first week in June (finals week), was meant to be the major product of spring quarter. Because of the great amount of time allowed for it, the scope was intended to be somewhat greater than the standard (10-12 pp.) undergraduate term paper. These projects also satisfied the Women's Studies Program's requirement that all majors submit a senior project, though it need not be the same as the seminar project.

The assignment was set up in winter so that students could pursue their own interests in a feminist context. They were also provided with introductions to a variety of other research perspectives to explore in developing projects. The field of women's studies offers possibilities for much original work, even by students relatively new to research. Our intent in assigning a research paper was to get students to take advantage of this unusual academic situation and to avoid the dull reportage that often plagues undergraduate papers.

Thus, it was hoped that the paper would reflect the possibilities of women's studies. For the most part, this occurred. Some students, however, came into the course with problems in writing and research skills. These problems, quite naturally, surfaced in the final papers.

4. Evaluations. Each student was asked to write an evaluation of her own and other seminar members' discussion leading and research presentations. These evaluations were designed to give students feedback on their own work and to provide them with written records of their participation in the seminar. Evaluations were signed by the writer and distributed to each student. An additional function of this assignment was to offer practice in the responsible exercise of critical skills.

Grading

In spring, students were assigned a composite grade based on performance in the oral presentation and on the paper. Instructors met together after the last presentation to assign preliminary grades, having agreed that grades would be changed if the paper were either significantly better or worse than the presentation. Criteria on which the grade was based included: organization and grasp of material, effectiveness of presentation, clarity of issues, fulfillment of goals outlined in the proposal, significance of subject matter, and evidence of analytical and interpretive ability.

Discussion leading and evaluations were not graded, but were considered in assigning a final grade when students were on the border between grades.

Many students had exercised the option of taking an in progress grade for winter and have all their grades from winter and spring averaged at the end. They then took the same grade for two quarters or, in borderline cases, a split grade that reflected either improvement or decline.

Instructors

The four instructors from winter quarter continued as seminar participants in the spring quarter, though impact was reduced somewhat by having the students facilitate discussions.

Instructors were responsible for advising and evaluating students and their projects. Each instructor advised at least two students. These assignments were made on the basis of student choice or common research interests. The amount of contact between advisors and students varied according to student need.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS

Results of the evaluation of the winter quarter and spring quarter Women's Studies Senior Seminars are presented below. First, a description of the Senior Seminar students is presented. The second section reports the evaluation results for the winter Senior Seminar; and the third section, those for spring quarter. All of the data are summarized in Appendices D and E. Because of the small size of the seminars, the findings are reported in terms of frequencies.

To obtain a general description of the students in the course, information was requested regarding their age, marital status, major, year in school, cumulative grade point average, educational aspiration, vocational/educational plans, and involvement in women's studies and feminist groups. These data were acquired from the Background Information Form (Appendix D) completed at the beginning of winter quarter. The students also were asked to specify, at the beginning of winter quarter, their goals for the course and at the end, the degree to which these were met. At the end of both winter and spring quarters, the students completed Course Evaluation Forms (Appendix E) to assess their reactions to the seminars.

Student Characteristics

Descriptive information about the students who first began the Senior Seminar in the fall quarter of 1976 and continued into the winter quarter (N = 14) plus two students who began Winter quarter 1977 are provided in Tables 1 through 3 in Appendix D.

Sixteen women were officially enrolled in the course. Fourteen were primarily day school students while two were a combination of half day school-half extension division students. All students were working on degrees, eleven full-time and five part-time. In addition to being students, all but two were currently employed, four full-time and ten part-time. The women ranged in age from 21 to 33 years, with an average age of 24.4 years. Nine students were single (never married), two were married, three were divorced, one was separated, and one stated "other."

All students were upper division: Four were juniors, eleven seniors, and one an adult special. Twelve women stated a major in Women's Studies, three stated interdisciplinary majors which included Women's Studies (one with French, one with law, and one with history and anthropology), and one stated no major. Two students cited bachelor's degrees as the highest level of education they hoped to attain, nine said master's degrees, two said doctoral degrees, two stated professional degrees without being more specific, and one stated she did not know what her highest educational aspiration level was. With the exception of four students who did not know or were not sure, the students declared University of Minnesota grade point averages of 3.6-4.0 (two), 3.1-3.5 (eight), and 2.6-3.0 (two). (See Table 1.)

All of the students had completed some Women's Studies courses prior to the seminar: three students had 1 or 2, six--3 or 4, six--5 or 6, and one--7 or 8. In addition, seven had completed 1 or 2 courses about women outside of the Women's Studies Program, four--3 or 4 courses about women, and five--none.

All the women reported having had some involvement with the women's movement. Some amount of feminist literature was read by 12 women, and some research and writing about women by two. Nine women reported previous and/or present involvement in women's groups. Involvement in relevant feminist political activities was reported by five, and work for feminist organizations by two. One student cited self-contact and self-awareness as her involvement. (See Table 2.)

Comments on their educational and vocational plans were provided by 11 students in the final Course Evaluation Form. Graduate or professional degree work were anticipated by four women while five were not sure of their educational plans beyond the bachelor's degree. The following vocational plans were expressed by one woman each: work with women (teaching, counseling, or organizing); Women's Studies; women and criminal justice; women and literature; law, public health, or women's history; and Ph.D. to teach plus MBA to make money and support feminist enterprises. (See Table 3.)

Winter Quarter Senior Seminar

Tables 4 through 19 provide summary data regarding the students' evaluations of the winter quarter Senior Seminar. Sixteen students were enrolled in the winter seminar, 11 of whom completed the final Course Evaluation Form. Not all of the 11 women who completed the form answered every item; thus, a variable N exists for different items.

Readings

Students (N = 11) commented on the readings assigned by the individual instructors of the team. Each set of readings is considered separately with regard to four dimensions: Level of difficulty, suitability to the course objectives, relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis, and usefulness to the students' own interests and objectives. The frequency of response varied on each dimension for the various assigned readings. Frequencies of the "no comment" responses are reported in Table 4, but not here.

1. Philosophy and Sociology of Science (N = 11). All 11 respondents found these readings difficult. Two students found the readings suitable to the course objectives while three did not and four were not sure. A relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis was seen by six, but not by three students. Usefulness to their own interests and objectives was felt by three students but not by five.

2. Anthropology (N = 11). The anthropology readings were not

difficult for ten students; and seven found them suitable to the course objectives while two did not. Four students saw and four did not see a relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis. The students were similarly divided on whether or not they found the readings useful for their own interests and objectives.

3. Literary Criticism (N = 11). The literary criticism readings were not difficult for ten students. Suitability to the course objectives was felt by six students, not felt by one, and another was not sure. Relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis was seen by seven students but not by one. Similarly, seven students found the readings useful to their own interests and objectives, while three did not.

4. C. G. Jung (N = 11). The Jung readings were not difficult for five students, but were for two, and one found some difficult, some not. Four students found the readings suitable to the course objectives while five did not; and they were similarly divided on relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis. Usefulness to their own interests and objectives was seen by six students but not by one.

5. Marxism (= 11). Seven students found the Marxism readings difficult, while one did not. Suitability of the readings to the course objectives, was seen by six students, but not by two; and they were similarly divided on relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis. Eight students felt they were useful to their own interests and objectives while one did not.

6. Biases in Behavioral and Social Sciences (N = 11). These readings were difficult for five students, but were not for four, and three found some difficult and some not. Ten students found them suitable to the course objectives; nine saw a relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis, and eight felt the readings were useful to their own interests and objectives. The other students did not comment.

Written Assignments

The students were asked to evaluate the written assignments designated by a given instructor for a specific topic.

They were asked to respond in terms of the level of difficulty, the suitability to course objectives, the relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis, and the usefulness to the students' own interests and objectives. Their comments, broken down by the five topics, appear in Table 5. The frequency of response varied for each dimension and assignment. Frequencies of the "no comment" responses are shown in the table and occasionally noted here.

1. Feminist Methodology and Assumptions in Anthropology (N = 11). Three students did not find this written assignment difficult while five did. Suitability to course objectives was seen by four but not by two students; and three saw a relationship but one did not to an interdisciplinary emphasis. Three felt the assignment useful to their own interests and assumptions while two did not. A number of students did not comment on the latter three dimensions.

2. Feminist Literary Criticism. The written assignment on feminist criticism was not difficult for six students, though it was for two and one was not sure. Six students found it suitable to the course objectives while one did not, and another was uncertain. A relationship

to an interdisciplinary emphasis was seen by three students. The other eight offered no comment. Seven found the assignment to be useful to their own interests and objectives while one did not.

3. Jungian Concepts and the Feminist Perspective. The written assignment on Jungian concepts was not difficult for six students, though it was for three. Suitability to the course objectives was found by five students but not by another. Four students did, and three did not, see its relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis as well as its usefulness to their own interests and objectives.

4. Marxist Approach in Own Project, or Methodology Used in a Marxist-Feminist Article. The written assignment on Marxism was not difficult for five students though it was for two. Seven students found the assignment suitable to the course objectives, and five saw a relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis. Six offered no comment. Usefulness to their own interests and objectives was felt by six but not by three students.

5. Trends, Themes, Highlights in the Readings on Biases in the Behavioral and Social Sciences. The written assignment regarding biases in the behavioral and social sciences was not difficult for four students though it was for three. Six students found it suitable to the course objectives, while five offered no comment; and four saw a relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis while seven did not offer a comment. Usefulness to their own interests and objectives was felt by five students, but not by one.

Effectiveness of Teaching

1. Grasp of the Material, Communication Skills/Clarity of Presentation, and Attitudes Toward Students. The students were asked several open-ended questions on the Course Evaluation Form about the instructors. Each of the instructors is considered below on each of three dimensions as they enhanced or detracted from the course: grasp of the material, communication skills/clarity of presentation, and attitudes toward students. (See Table 6 for more detail.)

All of the students said that Register's grasp of literary criticism enhanced the course. Seven of the 11 respondents said her grasp of the Marxism material enhanced and four said it detracted from the course. Almost all the students (ten) said her communication skills and clarity of presentation enhanced the course, as did her attitudes toward students (eight).

Dewald's grasp of the material was found by six students to enhance the course while three said it did not. They were almost evenly divided on whether or not her communication skills and clarity of presentation enhanced or detracted from the course. Six students indicated that her attitudes toward students enhanced the course while two said it did not and one was not sure.

Jones' grasp of the anthropology material enhanced the course according to nine students, while seven said her grasp of the Jung material enhanced and four said it detracted from the course. Ten students believed that her communication skills and clarity of presentation enhanced the course. Jones' attitudes toward students were felt by five students to have enhanced the course while one said it detracted, and three were not certain.

All of the students said Faunce's grasp of the material enhanced the course as did her communication skills and clarity of presentation. Her attitudes toward students were said by ten students to have enhanced the course.

2. Instructor as a Person, Overall Teaching Ability, and How Much Learned. Three Likert-type questions also were asked regarding the instructor on the Course Evaluation Form. Responses to these are included in Table 7.

Most of the 10 respondents said they liked Register as a person exceptionally well to very much, that her overall teaching ability was excellent to exceptionally good, and that they had learned very much from her.

The majority of the 10 respondents said that they liked Dewald as a person very much to a lot, that her overall teaching ability was good, and that they learned a fair amount from her.

Most of the 10 respondents said they liked Jones as a person exceptionally well to somewhat, that her overall teaching ability was good, and that they learned very much to a fair amount from her.

The majority of the 9 respondents said they liked Faunce exceptionally well to very much as a person, that her overall teaching ability was excellent, and that they had learned much to an exceptional amount from her.

3. Effectiveness of Team Approach. Students also were asked in an open-ended question format about the effectiveness of the team of instructors, and the use of a team approach in the Senior Seminar.

Five students had positive comments regarding the team of instructors, e.g., cooperative, supportive, competent, flexible, organized, prepared, coordinated, learned from and reinforced each other, enjoyed each other, integrated knowledge, effective, non-competitive, and non-hierarchial. Five students had negative comments, e.g. sometimes seemed competitive, little cohesiveness, fairly ineffective, and inadequate working relations. Six students said a team approach should be used in the Senior Seminar while two said it should not, and another was not sure. (See Table 8.)

Other Aspects of the Course Evaluation

1. Course in General (N = 11). Table 9 presents the summary data for the Likert-type questions regarding the course in general which were part of the Course Evaluation Form. Most of the students felt that grading procedures were appropriate, that the amount of required work was appropriate, that adequate help was available when needed, that they liked the subject matter of the course and not only had put a great deal of effort into the course, but had also learned from the course. They tended to be divided on whether or not their responsibilities in the course were clearly defined, their background for the course was adequate, and their willingness to recommend the course to a friend.

2. Factors Which Heightened and Diminished Students' Motivation (N = 11). In an open-ended question, the students were asked what things about the course particularly heightened or diminished their motivation to really "get into" the subject matter (Table 10). Their

motivation was heightened by the interesting subjects, the quality of the instructors and their attitudes, the interdisciplinary emphasis, the discussions, the psychology readings, and their project. Course aspects which diminished their motivation included too many readings, lack of clear expectations and goals, irrelevance of materials, shortness of time spent on each topic, and the lack of integration of areas.

3. Factors Most Satisfying and Disappointing (N = 11). The class was also asked to comment on what things were most satisfying and most disappointing about the course (Table 11). Among others, the most satisfying things were said to be "academically substantive material," "interdisciplinary nature of the course," "readings," "honest, nonjudgmental, nonhierarchical structure and atmosphere," and "my feelings of accomplishment with work." Some of the most disappointing factors were "too much to learn so nothing was absorbed," "no depth in any one topic," "lack of sense of group," and "my lack of knowledge of areas."

4. Similarities to Other Students (N = 11). The students were asked to comment regarding their felt similarity to or difference from the other students in the seminar (Table 12). Some of the similarities indicated were "unity among students," "much frustration with course," "much questioning of design of this quarter," "all concerned and bright women," "all Women's Studies majors and feminists," and "no dominating personalities."

The differences included "had less of the background than most," "I felt incomplete and ignorant," "I'm more academically oriented," "I'm more interested in women and law," and "I'm a worker (not a student)."

Student Self-Evaluations of Their Own Contributions to the Course

Several questions on the Course Evaluation Form pertained to the student's self-assessment of her own contribution to the seminar. A summary of these self-assessments are provided in Table 13. Most of the 11 students believed they assumed very much to a fair amount of responsibility for their own learning in the Seminar, but that they assumed less responsibility (a fair amount to very little) for the learning of others.

When asked to indicate the ways in which they contributed to the course they said such things as "I raised questions," "I discussed material in and out of class," "I worked hard on papers," "I did all the readings," and "I attended class." One student said she contributed little, another said she did not know how she contributed.

When asked how they felt about their contributions, they said "my contributions were noteworthy but not earthshaking," "I hope to contribute more next quarter when the focus is more practical," "they weren't worth much," and "I feel bad."

Influence on Education and Vocation

Some open-ended questions addressed issues regarding the impact that the seminar had on the students. Their responses are reported in Tables 14 and 15.

1. Relationship to and Approach in Other Courses (N = 11). When they were asked to comment on how the Senior Seminar related to other courses that they had taken, students said that the "content was similar to some previous courses," that it "made me more able to examine critically their contents and integrate them," that it "added a feminist perspective to old material," and that it "added clarity to traditional foggy areas."

When asked how the seminar affected their approach in other courses students commented, "had a balancing effect when looking at women's experiences," "will use more non-traditional sources," "will be more interdisciplinary on approach in other areas," "will be more skeptical," "will be more able to analyze readings," "will look for sexism and other biases," and "will understand other disciplines better." (See Table 14.)

2. Education and Educational/Vocational Plans. The class indicated ways in which the seminar did or did not contribute to their education and did or did not affect their educational and vocational plans (Table 15). They spoke of contributions to their education in the following kinds of ways: "introduced me to interesting, important new areas," "gave me insight about approaches to take in other areas," "more depth," and "introduced me to feminist readings." Two students indicated that it did not contribute much.

Most of the students said the seminar had no effect on their educational/vocational plans while a few others indicated otherwise--"made me want to go into academia," "made me want to have a professional career," and "increased my confidence in questioning biases."

Goals

1. Student Goals. The students were asked to list their goals for the seminar at the beginning of the quarter. The goals of the ten students who both listed their goals on the first day of class and evaluated them on the last day of class are provided in Table 16. The ten students listed 20 goals. Fourteen of these goals for the seminar involved an academic concern: almost all of these were said by the students to be "met" or "partially met." The academic goals were:

1) Define/develop a "feminist" perspective in methodology.
2) Help me introduce feminism in a positive manner to academia.
3) Learn about research on women and its effects on women (and women's studies). Learn what feminists are creating.
4) Help me devise research in my areas of interest.
5) Develop a research project which I actually do as opposed to a paper.
6) To feel a basic gut excitement about learning to do my own research.
7) Learn about good research techniques, resources, facilities.
8) Determine importance of methodology per se.
9) To understand fully what is meant by a "methodology."
10) Learn about methodologies of other disciplines (academic) and how they came about.
11) Learn to criticize research findings and literature.
12) To have a lot of input in the course--an essential aspect in feminist teaching.
13) Understand subject matter on a non-abstract level.

14) Learn what the Women's Studies Program expects of its majors.

Six personal goals also were listed by the students and almost all of these were "met" or "partially met." These personal goals were:

1) Help me find direction in my education and/or life.
2) Experience and learn more about feminism and a (my) feminist perspective.
3) Broaden my base of knowledge about myself as a woman or "female person."
4) Maintain contact with bright women (i.e. maintain sanity).
5) Come to a compromise between my idealistic expectations and the realities so that my efforts will have relevance.
6) Lose my fear of research.

2. Instructor Goals. The students were asked in the Course Evaluation Form what they thought were the goals/objectives of the instructors for the winter quarter seminar. Five objectives were given (Table 17): "Teach us the methodologies of various disciplines," "define and think about 'feminist perspective," "teach us research skills," "prepare us to do our spring projects," and "supply us with information."

3. Women's Studies Senior Seminar Goals. The students were asked at the end of the seminar, "As you see it at this point, what do you believe the goals/objectives of a Women's Studies Senior Seminar ought to be? Their responses are shown in Table 18.

With regard to what the goals ought to be, the comments included that it should define feminist methodology, deal with job-related issues, help students to feel close to one another, have student input, focus on areas of student concentration, be cross-disciplinary, and integrate areas.

4. Expectations for Spring Quarter Senior Seminar (N = 11). Students were asked on the final Course Evaluation Form, "What are your expectations for the course spring quarter, e.g., what do you and do you not look forward to, what would you like to see happen, not happen, etc.?" More communication and cohesiveness among the 11 students was hoped for, and projects and self-directed work were looked forward to. Other comments were related to the desire to receive help with a job search to talk about practical applications of the material, to learn a lot, and to be fairly and objectively evaluated. (See Table 19.)

Spring Quarter 1977

Tables 20-35 in Appendix E provide summary data regarding the students' evaluation of the spring quarter Senior Seminar. Ten students were enrolled in the spring seminar, six of whom completed the final Course Evaluation Form.

Readings and Discussion

Students responded to several questions in the Course Evaluation Form regarding the reading and discussion of the assigned text, The Second Sex by Simone de Beauvior. (See Table 20 and 21.) All of the six respondents said the book was appropriate to the course. One half said it provided them with much insight and the other half with little insight into issues they dealt with in their projects.

Four students felt that facilitating class discussions on The Second Sex taught them something about themselves; two said it taught them little. Further comments about themselves in the Course Evaluation Form included "more open about time limitation," "more flexible," "less structured," "cannot (completely) control discussion," "team teaching is great," "learned I can work in a group," "helped me feel more comfortable speaking," "learned what teachers go through in preparing," "team teaching takes time, compromise," and "I'm not very comfortable."

Students were asked to write evaluations of their own performances as discussion leaders. Comments from these written evaluations included "I think I did a good job as discussion leader," "well prepared," "would do it differently again," "adequate and nothing more," "discussion focused too much on personal issues," and "angry that co-leader was irresponsible."

Spring Project

A number of different questions were asked regarding various aspects of the primary Senior Seminar project completed in the spring quarter. Student responses to these questions can be found in Tables 22-25.

1. Project Advisor. While half of the six respondents desired help from their project advisors, the other half desired little or none. Two students sought help from their project advisor while four sought little or no help. Comments regarding the helpfulness of their project advisor ranged from excellent to good help. (See Table 22.)

2. Oral Report on Project. Responses to the question "How valuable to you was your oral report on your project?" ranged from an exceptional amount to a fair amount. Four students said that their oral report taught them a fair amount about themselves and one said an exceptional amount, while a sixth said "little." Comments when asked to elaborate on this included that they learned how easy it was to speak, to organize material selectively, to be relaxed in a group, to develop less structured presentations and be comfortable, to manage audio-visual equipment, and they developed a fascination with research. One student said it confirmed that she was not good at public speaking and that her nervousness got in the way. (See Table 23.)

When asked how much they learned, in general, from the oral reports of the other students, their responses (N = 4) ranged from a fair amount to an exceptional amount. When asked about their learning from each of the oral presentations, the students replied they had learned from six of the presentations, but were divided on how much they had learned from three. (See Table 24.)

3. Project Effort, Value and Goals. In terms of effort, the six respondents noted that they had put in an exceptional amount to much effort on their projects. When asked to describe what their project overall offered of value to them, their responses included "instilled in me a desire to fight for self and beliefs," "deeper sense of feminism for combat," "helped me learn about resource facilities," "help sway toward education/work endeavors," "helped learn about feminist research,"

"personal growth," "advice to keep open mind," "have more healthy view of female-male relationships," and "taught me much."

Their responses as to what the goals/objectives of doing a project for the spring seminar seemed to be included "do feminist research," "share knowledge with others," "explore subject for personal use," "contribute to women's studies field," "culmination of women's studies work," "get into a project," and "find varied resources." These goals were said to be met or partially met. (See Table 25.)

4. Written Project Paper. Five of the respondents said that the written paper on their project was of exceptional to very much value to them, while one student said it was of very little value. (See Table 25.)

Other Aspects of the Course Evaluation

1. Course in General. All or most of the six respondents agreed that the grading procedures were appropriate, that adequate information about how well they were doing was available, that their responsibilities were clearly defined, and that they had adequate background for the spring seminar. Four students agreed that the amount of work required was appropriate and that they would recommend the seminar to a friend; two did not. Regarding the format of the course, four said they liked it somewhat while two said they liked it a lot. Five students said they learned a fair amount to an exceptional amount from the course, one said she learned little. All the students noted that they put a fair to an exceptional amount of effort in the course. (See Table 26.)

2. Factors Which Heightened and Diminished Student Motivation. Factors which heightened the motivation of the six respondents to really "get into" the subject matter included The Second Sex by Simone de Beauvoir, issues raised by the projects, interest in specific topics (e.g., power, women's film), one's own presentation, comments by advisor and instructors, and a sense of responsibility. Course aspects which diminished their motivation included the de Beauvoir text (took too much time, too difficult), met too seldom (hard to maintain continuity and feelings of closeness), discussions too superficial, too many teachers, and too much work. (See Table 27.)

3. Factors Most Satisfying and Disappointing. The most satisfying things in class were said by the six respondents to include the de Beauvoir text, their project, their oral report, discussions, relating material to women, different approaches and insights, closeness among students and teachers. Students were disappointed by such things as the difficulty of the de Beauvoir text, insufficient input from advisors and teachers, the amount of work, and not enough time devoted to discussion of power. One student said nothing was disappointing. (See Table 28.)

4. Similarities of Students. The six respondents felt they were similar to each other in the following ways; "WoSt courses and feminist background and sympathies," "shared reading, risk-taking, and personal revelations," "sense of all being apart from many other people we approach daily," and "closer emotionally."

The dissimilarities were seen as "differences in political orientation and interests, greater involvement in social activism," "others have more well-defined career plans," "being older and less idealistic and more experienced," and feeling "left out as a lesbian." (See Table 29.)

Student Self-Evaluations of Their Own Contributions to the Course

The six respondents indicated they had assumed a fair to an exceptional amount of responsibility for their own learning in the spring seminar. Four students felt they had also assumed much responsibility for the learning of others while two said they had assumed little.

When asked to indicate the ways in which they contributed to the seminar, their responses included "discussion input," "oral presentation," "always did reading and preparation," "listening," "helped others with their projects," "spent time and contemplation on the evaluation form." When asked how they felt about their contributions, they said "wish I had put more into discussions," "good" (about their facilitating or presenting), "good (but regretful of absences)," and "very positive."

Influence on Education and Vocation

Some open-ended questions addressed issues regarding the students' educational and/or vocational life and plans. Their responses are shown in Tables 31 and 32.

1. Relationship to and Approach in Other Courses. Five of six respondents saw the relationship of the spring Senior Seminar to other courses in the following ways: "opportunity to work on a senior project," "real coordination with two other courses," "drew on experiences of other disciplines," "affected paper choice in another course," "helped identify why I had trouble accepting a lot of what's taught in traditional courses."

The seminar was said to affect their approach in other courses in such ways as "more knowledge and awareness of methodologies, biases, values," "I get angry in non-WoSt courses because they are still teaching sexist rubbish," "strengthened and refined my feminist perspective," "de Beauvoir enlightening in review of other disciplines."

2. Education and Educational/Vocational Plans. The six respondents indicated ways in which the spring Senior Seminar had contributed to their education and did or did not affect their educational/vocational plans. They listed the following contributions to their education: "book useful--learned greatly, provided solid theoretical foundation, helped me to see how basic and pervasive sexism is," "valuable to practice using feminist perspective in research," "first time for independent study and excellent, enough feedback," "opportunity plus background to do research in different disciplines," "student reports informed me."

Comments as to how the spring seminar affected their educational/vocational plans included "plan to do graduate work with a focus on women," "stirred interest in working politically," "added impetus to do women's films," "reaffirmed desire to work for women in a feminist organization," "not vastly changed, but strengthened feminism and humanism."

Continuity of Senior Seminar Over Two Quarters

The students were asked, "Looking back, how do the two quarters, winter and spring, of the Senior Seminar 'hang together'?" The positive responses of the six respondents (Table 33) included "helpful for project, especially methodologies," "illustrated use of disciplinary approach to feminist research," "general continuity," "good interplay," and "better than fall/winter." Their negative responses were "too academic and hard to relate to my life," "topics far too broad," "winter quarter difficult--like trying to bake bread after being given only 1/2 a recipe and a few ingredients," and "not well."

Senior Seminar Goals and Role of Senior Seminar in the Women's Studies Program

The students were again asked what they believed the goals and objectives of a Women's Studies Seminar ought to be. Some of their comments (Table 34) were as follows: "help with career, life plan, dealing with society, graduate school," "concentration on feminism: philosophy, major works," "promote sisterhood," "time for synthesizing/integrating/evaluating," "valuable use of varied expertise of instructors," "should entail active involvement in political activities of Women's Movement," "enable student to pursue something of interest and get credit for it," and "not really sure."

Further Evaluative Comments and Suggestions

The students also were asked to provide additional evaluative comments and suggestions. Some of their suggestions were: "need more ongoing information and feedback regarding progress," "a theme for three quarters would have unified matters," "perhaps offer one quarter of this sequence in the junior year," "maybe do one agreed-upon project with each individual going in-depth into one segment," and "needs less work or more credits." (See Table 35.)

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

Because this Senior Seminar sequence was viewed as an experiment, we, the teaching team, knew all along that we would have to give it close scrutiny and derive some lessons from it that would be useful not only to ourselves, but also to others designing similar courses. That means we had to be prepared to reveal our shortcomings as well as boast of our achievements. Our process of self- and mutual-evaluation has not always been pleasant, but we feel that it is a vital part of the growth of women's studies.

We opened the winter quarter with mixed feelings of headiness and trepidation. We had spent much of fall quarter anticipating, as well as planning, and we knew that there were both strengths and weaknesses in the course we had designed.

We expected the 1977 seminar to be an improvement over the course taught the year before, largely because of the team-teaching. Having four teachers trained in different areas rather than one "generalist" would surely allow us to probe deeper into particular questions and address them from a more secure position of expertise. Exposure to new areas, when introduced by people well-acquainted with them, would, we thought, fire the students' enthusiasm and lead to some lively discussions. The fact that we were of different ages and life-styles and at different points in our careers would expand the role-modeling function that female teachers can perform for female students. Because our personalities and our teaching styles were also quite different, each student would be able to find at least one teacher with whom she felt comfortable and could build rapport. We were also pleased to be trying a collective model of teaching which seemed more compatible with a feminist perspective than having a single authority in the classroom.

We had high expectations of the students, as well. This particular group had had longer access to women's studies classes and would thus have a more solid grounding in the field than the students the year before. Also, they would have spent a quarter together prior to taking our segment of the seminar, so that we would not have to concern ourselves with building group cohesion. The fall quarter seminar would expose them to the concept "feminist perspective," so that we could proceed from a more advanced departure point. We expected, in short, a cohesive group of young feminist scholars who would share our enthusiasm about and commitment to women's studies as a field of inquiry.

We also knew enough to prepare for some problems. Our prior experience in the Women's Studies Program had exposed us to some recurring dilemmas and frustrations. Because we ourselves have often had difficulty integrating our academic values and our feminist goals, we expected this to be a source of frustration, and we knew that some students would doubt the relevance of women's studies to the problems encountered by women in the "real world." Each of us had her own well-honed set of arguments and examples to apply to this problem. We knew, too, that this dilemma sometimes polarizes students with long-term academic interests and students with a stronger activist orientation. Nevertheless, we thought that this group, being senior Women's Studies majors, would be familiar enough with such problems and committed enough to our mutual enterprise to deal with them in a congenial and sisterly fashion. Women's Studies students tend to be unusually independent and self-motivating, with strong opinions about their place in the university. We welcome this as boding well for the future of women, though we sometimes find ourselves on the receiving end of students' dissatisfactions with higher education. We expected some resistance to any claims of authority and expertise we might make, but felt that we could establish a collegial relationship with the students, regarding ourselves as joint contributors to an emerging field of study.

These problems seem to be endemic to women's studies. We anticipated others for which we ourselves would have to claim responsibility. After we had finished drawing up our course outline, we were somewhat concerned about its general coherence, but decided to rely on our classroom procedure to fit it together rather than redesign the course. Although we felt some lack of clarity about the conceptual foundations of women's studies and the meaning of terms like "feminist" and "interdisciplinary," we did not undertake a rigorous discussion of basic issues, but spent our time on practical matters like making up the schedule and selecting resources. Instead of striving for consensus, we trusted in the value of diversity. This left some room for confusion.

The academicism vs. activism dilemma did surface very early in the quarter and stayed with us throughout the course. We found, however, that we could not resolve it in the ways we had anticipated, because of some obstacles for which we were unprepared. The very first day of class we met with some hostility that apparently grew out of unexpressed and unsettled dissatisfactions with the fall quarter seminar. Some of the students felt that there had not been enough opportunity for student input into the class and that it had been too heavily directed by the teachers. Unfortunately, our plan for a highly structured winter quarter bore a close resemblance to the fall seminar. The students felt that they would have to postpone their special interests until spring quarter, despite their eagerness to apply what they had learned in previous Women's Studies courses. In some cases, their impatience took the form of unwillingness to read or hear about work being done in disciplines not directly relevant to their own interests. Since we had not gone through the fall quarter with them, we had difficulty deciding to what extent their impatience was justified.

We were also surprised by comments about the difficulty of the reading material. Some of the students felt that it was more appropriate to the graduate level. We realized that the course was very compact and that the reading selections were demanding and thought-provoking, but we had expected, on the basis of our previous experience, that the class would be willing to struggle with them. On the contrary, they seemed to feel intimidated and were often hesitant to speak up in class discussions. Along with this, the presence of four teachers had quite a different effect than the one we had anticipated. Our hope that we would be perceived as a diverse group of individuals, each of whom would feel rapport with different students, was not fulfilled until fairly late in the seminar sequence. Instead, some of the students viewed us as a solid, authoritative bloc and found us four times more intimidating than a single teacher. These students were especially reluctant to speak in class. Because the silences were generally bothersome to the teachers, we rushed to fill them in, reinforcing this top-heavy impression. Thus, a three-dimensional set of group dynamics developed: teacher-teacher, teacher-student, and student-student.

The latter relationship was perhaps the least developed. On several occasions, the students expressed regret that they had not really gotten to know each other during the fall quarter. Their faces were familiar, and they knew each other's first names, but they had little personal information beyond that. Because we expected an already cohesive group, we had not made room in our plan for the winter quarter for the kinds of discussion that build mutual trust and support. This became a source of frustration for both teachers and students. It was not until spring quarter, when our discussions of Simone de Beauvoir's The Second Sex elicited some personal anecdotes, that we felt we got to know each other.

Shortly after the start of fall quarter, three students approached Cheri Register after class and told her about their dissatisfaction with the course. At first they only said that they were confused by the lectures Barbara Dewald had given during the previous two class periods and wanted to know if the course would continue in that way. One of the students was close to tears and said that she felt dumb for the first time in her life. Register immediately arranged a meeting with Dewald, interpreting the problem as a temporary one that would be resolved once she had heard their comments. Instead, as the students talked, it became apparent that there were more deeply-seated dissatisfactions with the structure of the seminar. These three students felt that the methodological focus of the course did not match their interests and would not be useful to them after graduation, that the material was too difficult, that the teachers' presence was top-heavy and intimidating, and that there was no room for setting forth their own objectives.

The instructors responded by setting aside the plan for the next class session and having an open discussion about the course instead. We went around the room asking each person (both teacher and student) to express her feelings about the seminar. In addition, each of the teachers described what she intended to do in the sessions she was responsible for and asked for comments and suggestions. Some of the criticisms raised by the three students were echoed by the others, but not with the same intensity. We came away feeling that the air had been cleared and that we had the students' support for proceeding with our original plan, as long as we took care in the individual class sessions to allow for adequate student participation.

Nevertheless, the criticism did not subside. One student in particular, and at times two, continued to lodge complaints about the course. A few others made their dissatisfactions known to Judy Wanhala, the Women's Studies Program's student advisor. The criticism also took a new form, becoming a rather vindictive personal attack. This was not addressed to the teachers as a team, nor spread evenly among the four of us, but instead fell most heavily and directly on the two teachers who were closest to the student in age and experience and who were most accessible (regularly present in the building where the class was held). The student claimed to be criticizing the course out of an activist political perspective, yet she directed her criticism at the most activist, politically-oriented teachers, who were, of course, more vulnerable to it. We are mentioning this not to get even with this student, but because we feel these problems need examining.

Women's Studies teachers generally make an effort to be whole persons rather than unidimensional authority figures in our relation to students. We see some pedagogical value in taking personal risks, exposing our foibles in classroom discussions, relating academic material to our personal experiences. Yet, by making our personal selves visible, we also become vulnerable to *ad feminum* criticism. Also, we claim to be doing new things in new ways, to be freeing education of some conventional restraints. Because of this, we often find ourselves subjected to a double standard. This one most critical student told us that she never complained to her sociology instructors, though she found their courses boring and irrelevant, because she did not expect anything better from them. But she was quick to be angry with us if our teaching did not live up to the ideals we professed.

One of the teachers was approached by two students in a casual, informal way for advice on some personal problems that were interfering with their seminar work. She was pleased to know that the students found her approachable and wanted her as a friend as well as an instructor. Later, however, both of these students took advantage of that confidence, expecting that the teacher's inside information about their personal lives would excuse them from their responsibilities to the seminar. This, though understandable, was rather disheartening to the teacher involved.

These problems are not unusual, nor are they insurmountable, if faced and discussed openly. We must admit that there are risks involved in our attempts to integrate the academic, the political, and the personal, and to be teachers, allies, and friends.

This continuing criticism was rather painful and did affect our attitudes toward the seminar. We did not experience the great rapport and the classroom "highs" that make teaching so rewarding. But neither did we feel that we could stop frequently to assess the feelings of the class. Instead, we thought that the students should be responsible for letting us know if the course was not meeting their objectives. The majority of the students kept silent about that, but we were not really sure whether to interpret their silence as approval or to regard the most vociferous critic as a spokeswoman for the group. Things did improve considerably during the spring quarter, but the hard feelings were not easy to shed. Despite these problems, the seminar was not a failure. The student evaluations were more favorable than our uneasy feelings had led us to expect.

During the spring quarter, most of the students performed admirably as moderators in our discussions of *The Second Sex*. The quality of the senior projects completed at the end of spring quarter was quite impressive, and most of the students took this phase of the seminar very seriously, because of its direct application to their individual interests and goals.

The Senior Seminar has since been examined and reexamined by the instructors, the Program staff, and the Women's Studies Committee. Some of the problems inherent in the original plan for the Seminar have been identified and resolved:

1. A required three-quarter sequence in the last year of college is a heavy imposition on students who feel that they have not had enough other Women's Studies courses. The requirement has now been decreased to two separate quarter-long seminars that may be taken at any time in the junior or senior years. In effect, the students will get to choose two out of four alternatives offered. The first two such offerings, planned for 1978-79, are "Feminist Learning: the University and Beyond," taught by Cheri Register, and "Current Women's Issues," taught by Sara M. Evans, an Assistant Professor of History and a member of the Women's Studies Committee.

2. Describing the seminar as the "culmination" of the Women's Studies major's educational experience aroused some unreasonably high expectations and almost guaranteed disappointment. Now the seminars are described simply as intensified courses conducted in a small-group setting for students whose central interest is women's studies.

So that others may learn from our experience, we would like to make some additional, more specific recommendations for designing and conducting Women's Studies Seminars for junior and senior majors:

1. The design of the seminar should be based upon a set of objectives determined by asking and answering questions such as: What should seniors in the Women's Studies Program know by graduation? What gaps are there in their education to this point? What disciplines ought to be represented in the seminar material? In what disciplines do the potential students' own interests lie? What is the difference between multi-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and problem-focussed, and which do we want the seminar to be? What generalized methodological problems are shared by all or many disciplines? How can these be approached in an integrated fashion? A thorough discussion of such questions, by a curriculum committee, the Program faculty, the governing body of the Program, and/or potential seminar teachers, should precede the assignment of specific teachers to the seminar.

2. The division of responsibilities among teachers and students should be carefully spelled out the first day of class. Often the Women's Studies Seminar will be the students' first experience with the seminar format and individually-designed work. It is, for example, important to stress that participation in class discussion is essential--that a seminar cannot thrive on passivity.

3. The ways of conveying the meaning of concepts like "perspective," "world-view," "ideology," "methodology" should be carefully thought out in advance and should build on the students' experience. It might be useful, for instance, to ask one or more students to explain how they arrived at their particular form of feminism and use that as an example of how world-views are attained and how they change.

4. Prior to the seminar itself, the teachers should engage in some intense discussion of their own thoughts and feelings about women's studies and its relation to the women's movement and feminism--not necessarily to reach agreement, but to know what to expect of each other and to be able to draw on the variety of perspectives to help clarify complex issues that arise in class discussion. The teachers can, themselves, be models or examples of how ideology and methodology interact.

Also, this process is essential to achieving real team-teaching, rather than a simple division of labor.

5. Having an organizing theme or a common research problem to address can be very useful for integrating and making compatible a wide variety of methodologies. Setting the solution of a problem as a major course objective can also help underline the importance of women's studies to the women's movement.

6. If the development of a "feminist perspective" is one of the seminar's objectives, readings in feminist theory should be included in the course. This may be a matter of filling gaps, if the students are already familiar with some basic feminist texts.

7. The faculty-student ratio should be carefully considered. If the teaching team seems to intimidate the students and hamper their participation in class discussion, it might be better for the teachers to take turns coming to class. On the other hand, it is important for each of the teachers to develop personal rapport and trust with the students. An alternate team model might be a teacher-coordinator who provides continuity and stability, plus several other faculty resource people who come in as needed to teach about or to advise and evaluate student work in their disciplines.

8. In order for the seminar format to function without tension, it is important for the students to feel comfortable with each other. Some room for discussion of personal experience and beliefs, as they relate to the subject at hand, should be built into the course design. Extra, informal meetings--lunch, coffee, potluck suppers--can also be helpful.

9. The course will flow more smoothly if predictable patterns of behavior are established early on. For instance, it may be useful to allot time each period for discussing general working problems that arise--how to keep from procrastinating, how to limit your inquiry to a feasible scope. Or "going around the room" may be used as a means of collecting initial responses to a question or reactions to reading material. Resource people should be informed in advance about what patterns of behavior have been adopted.

10. Because students in general--and especially seniors--tend to balk at required courses, it is a good idea to offer a choice of alternatives, if the budget allows it. Short of that, a large group might be divided in half to pursue slightly different objectives.

APPENDIX A

GRANT PROPOSALS

Women's Studies
(McNaron)
Clark

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
APPLICATION FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANT
Center for Educational Development, 317 Walter Library

1. PROPOSAL AUTHORIZATION: (Check one) Departmental ☐ Collegiate ☐ All-University ☐ Do not write in this space.

2. BRIEF ABSTRACT OF PROPOSAL:
Team-taught year-long senior seminar focusing on inter-disciplinary feminist research methodology.

3. APPLICANT(S): (Name, Position, Department or Unit)
Toni McNaron, Co-ordinator Women's Studies
Shirley Clark, Chairperson, Women's Studies Committee

4. BUDGET (Append necessary detail)

	Period (dates) of project work	% of time	Amount
A. Faculty Salaries*			$ 9,480.00
B. Graduate Student Salaries* (Check appropriate classification) X R.A. __ T. Assoc. I __ T.A. X T. Assoc. II			$ 1,779.00
C. Undergraduate Student Salaries*			$ -----
D. Other Salaries* (Indicate title and rate)			$ -----
E. Honoraria*			$ 550.00
F. Charges for Services of University Agencies			$ 50.00
G. Equipment (Itemize)			$ 50.00
H. Supplies			$ 75.00
I. Other (Specify)			$
J. Total Proposed Budget			$ 11,909.00

*If more than one, attach schedule. Salary support for persons currently on University payroll should be based on current rates.

5. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE SOURCE AND AMOUNT OF ANY SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDS (Append detail)

Women's Studies budget: Supplies throughout year	$ 175.	
1/2 FTE Assistant Professor (winter & spring)	$3,756.	
1/2 FTE Teaching Associate II (winter & spring)	$3,384.	TOTAL $7,315.00

6. HAVE THE SMALL GRANTS OR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OR MEDIA PRODUCTION FUND SUPPORTED THIS OR RELATED PROJECTS IN THE PAST? Yes ____ No X

7. DURATION OF PROJECT:
From August 15, 1976 to June 30, 1977

8. SUBMITTED BY: (Individual to contact with questions)
Toni A. H. McNaron — February 18, 1976 — 373-3508
Signature — Date — Telephone

9. RECOMMENDED:

Name (Please type) ____ Chairman, Faculty/Student Review Committee ____ Signature ____ Date ____

Marcia M. Eaton — Department Head — Marcia M. Eaton — 2/18/76
Name (Please type) — Signature — Date

Name (Please type) ____ Dean ____ Signature ____ Date ____

FACULTY SALARIES:		
Planning Phase (August 15, 1976 to September 15, 1976)		
Patricia Faunce (Associate Professor)	$600.00	
Cheri Register (Assistant Professor)	$500.00	
Jennette Jones (Instructor)	$400.00	
Barbara Dewald (Teaching Associate II)	$350.00	
		$ 1,850.00
Winter Quarter		
Patricia Faunce (Associate Professor)	$2,141.00	
Jennette Jones (1/2 FTE Instructor)	$1,704.00	
		$ 3,845.00
Spring Quarter		
Patricia Faunce (Associate Professor)	$2,141.00	
Jennette Jones (1/2 FTE Instructor)	$1,704.00	$ 3,845.00
GRADUATE STUDENT SALARIES:		
1/4 FTE Research Associate (winter and spring)	$1,329.00	
		$ 1,329.00
HONORARIA:		
Fall Quarter for visitors (5 or 6)	$ 550.00	
		$ 550.00
EVALUATION:		
Faculty honoraria June 15 to June 30	$ 400.00	
Measurement Services Center (machine time)	$ 50.00	
Printing of report	$ 75.00	
		$ 525.00
EQUIPMENT:		
Slide and film projectors (used often winter & spring)	$ 50.00	
		$ 50.00
TOTAL		$ 11,994.00

10. PLEASE LIST ALL UNIVERSITY SERVICE UNITS WHICH WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THIS PROJECT AND INDICATE THOSE WHICH HAVE BEEN CONSULTED IN FORMULATING THIS APPLICATION.

Measurement Services Center will be used extensively (along with the Women's Studies evaluation committee) to evaluate the seminar at every stage. Not only have we consulted with them, but one of the faculty for the course is the Director of that Center. MSC is interested in the proposal, since it constitutes work in new knowledge and so offers a valuable situation in which to develop new forms of evaluation.

Central Duplicating will be used extensively, since so much of the textual material will not be readily available to students. While not involving them in the design of this proposal, we are in regular contact with them about other programmatic needs, and so know when to get material to them in order to insure its return.

Audio-Visual aids will be used during winter and spring. Again, we are in contact with them and know that any equipment asked for can be obtained easily from that office.

11. PRESENT STATUS OF THE PROGRAM OR COURSE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSAL: (If course improvement, describe present course. If new method of presentation, describe method in current use. How does course relate to other courses and programs?)

In our original proposal for a Women's Studies Program, we stated that the capstone experience for our majors would be the year-long senior seminar. The academic year 1975-76 found the Program able to award a BA but, because of insufficient funds and late approval of the degree, we were not able to offer the twelve credits of work in a way which met expectations. We are, however, offering the seminar and learning rapidly what we want to do to make it the central learning experience which it was conceived of as being. We also have two year's experience with offering at least a single quarter of senior seminar work and so can profit from valuable aspects of those offerings and from mistakes. The proposal for this EDP grant comes from faculty who have taught in the program before (and in one instance from the present seminar instructor) and who already have committed their time to the seminar for next year. What we seek in asking for these funds is an opportunity to offer for the first time the kind of seminar which we always had in mind, enhanced as it is by experience and further thought by the staff and Curriculum Committee of the program.

The proposed seminar is an improvement over present practice in the following ways:

a) Each quarter will be structured in advance and become part of a sequential development of ideas and techniques for conducting feminist research (prior practice has been to make seminar staffing decisions at the last moment due to funding and staffing problems). Previously we have offered only one quarter of the seminar; this year we will have offered a seminar each quarter but these lack cohesive planning or continuity of staffing. Consequently, students will have been exposed to exciting but discrete learning units.

b) Students in the proposed seminar will have a year's work with each other, which is a learning goal long desired by the faculty and students of the program. Thus far, the seminar has either been one quarter in duration or planned so late as to prevent orderly registration by students over their year's schedule. Feminist education centers around such new subject matter and such fresh approaches to that subject matter that having to study it with continuously new classmates tends to erode that context most conducive to academic support and learning. By conducting this seminar in sequence, with a core of students and the same faculty planning the entire year's work, we hope to gain a sense of shared experience with the subject matter. We would expect productivity to increase with the quantity and in quality.

(#11 continued on next page)

(#11 continued)

The proposed seminar constitutes "New method of presentation" in the following ways:

a) The team structure for teaching the seminar represents a major gain for students and faculty alike. Previously we have had the conventional structure, i.e. one teacher, lots of students. This particularly hampers feminist teaching since our program is inter-disciplinary and to ask any single individual to be sufficiently knowledgable in enough different areas of research to cover a topic adequately is unrealistic and overly demanding. By having a team which has worked closely on pre-planning, we increase the intellectual rigor of the seminar and suggest a non-individualistic mode of doing feminist research--both of which are highly desirable goals.

b) The idea that students should work with the staff of their major program in an intellectual as well as advising context seems fairly rare within CLA. We found, by expediency (the staff had to cover the seminar credit needs of students this past fall because funding prevented us from planning a more structured seminar), that students appreciated the dialogue between staff and themselves. They also felt closer to the program for having this exchange about fundamental intellectual questions in feminist research and teaching, e.g. what is a feminist perspective in general and within a particular field of study, where are the library resources for such study, how do people talk who are actively engaged in such research, how can faulty and students work together to make discoveries about old knowledge and about new theories.

12. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT: (Detail the materials and methods to be used. Describe briefly each important step in the procedure.)

The Women's Studies Program proposes to develop the following design for its Senior Seminar to be offered during 1976-77.

1. Planning and development--By asking for funding to begin in August, we allow the relevant faculty to work together before classes begin. All too often new ideas are not maximally tested simply because they have not been maximally developed; recognizing this and the added complexity of having several faculty responsible for the course, we want to allow time for serious pre-thought. By the beginning of fall quarter, the entire year's program would exist (subject to variations arising from actual classroom work, of course), including the syllabi, structures, project designs for student research. Teaching in Women's Studies involves more emotional energy than often required in more established curricula. For this reason (seen as a plus by the program), it is more difficult to plan for future activities once a course is under way. However, the main justification for this step is simply that since the students served will be the same basic group, they will benefit most from a course which has a coherent design in which each work segment reflects overriding objectives and in which all work is based on definable theoretical constructs. Within the emerging field of feminist research, such constructs and coherence are not obtainable from some handbook on "how to conduct research in your chosen field." The faculty of this seminar are all persons who have spent hours worrying over questions about how to carry out and report feminist research. They and their students deserve the time to sit down quietly and share those tentative findings. We see this month of planning as more than usually necessary for the smooth progress of the seminar and for the furtherance of a feminist perspective.

2. Fall Quarter, 1976--This initial quarter will be taught by the Co-ordinator of the program (search in progress for new one), the Advisor/Administrative Assistant (Judy Wanhala) and the Directed Study/Field Experience Advisor (Etta Magnusen). In addition to these three primary faculty, Sandra Allen (Reference Librarian, Wilson Library) and Andrea Hinding (Archivist, Social Welfare Archives) will instruct students in present holdings in women's areas and in how to use those resources. This instruction will occur at the Library and the Archives Collection so that students can handle actual materials with which they may later work. By the end of this quarter, each student should be able to articulate a definition of a feminist perspective in general. While there is no settled definition of "feminist perspective," such an approach puts women and their behavior/accomplishments at the center of study and then conducts a contextual analysis of the culture around them, focussing on the interplay between individual development and the social expectations and realities within which such development is attempted. Additionally, each student must demonstrate a familiarity with resource collections here at the University and a working knowledge of other sources (Minnesota Historical Society, for instance, locally, and the Radcliffe Library or the special Feminist History Library, for instance, nationally). The quarter will include general readings about how feminism is carried into research and teaching settings, and about actual feminist research techniques as presently understood. In particular, certain important studies demonstrating various feminist research approaches will be read and analyzed for their theoretical bases and for their specific methods of proceeding. All faculty will be present at weekly meetings of the seminar and will jointly present the material. One goal of this initial quarter is to show students a model of team learning and research, so the faculty will consciously engage in discussion, debate, disagreement. Within the emerging field of feminist education, a commonly held aim is to learn along noncompetitive lines, thereby cutting against the present frenzy to "own" ideas

so often seen in research workers. The staff will display a different dynamic, namely an atmosphere in which genuine disagreement can surface and in which spirited debate occur, with the outcomes being ideas and findings no longer nearly assignable to one or another of the speakers.

3. Winter Quarter, 1977--At this point, the seminar becomes the responsibility of four faculty (who will have attended meetings during the fall to get to know the students and in some instances to see ways to alter structures and materials to be used for the next two quarters). These faculty are Barbara Dewald, Teaching Associate, Anthropology; Patricia Faunce, Associate Professor, Psychology and Director, Measurement Services Center; Jennette Jones, Instructor, Anthropology and Classics; Cheri Register, Visiting Assistant Professor, Women's Studies (Ph.D. Scandinavian Studies with emphasis on literature). What these four women will do during winter quarter is study systematically selected methodologies within various fields of research, looking specifically at their impact over the years and at the present time on research and findings about women. Each has found that dominant methodologies within western thought and practice are insufficient for conducting rigorous research on women. Since this position is not a commonly held one, and so perhaps subject to misunderstanding, we would like to include a short statement about the inadequacies of three such dominant methodologies and then a brief statement about why a new methodology must be sought if the subject of women is ever to be creatively and soundly researched.

   The three modes chosen for comment (which will be part of the focus of winter quarter's seminar) are freudian, marxist, and structuralist approaches to research. Professor Faunce, who would carry the major responsibility for psychological investigation, comments as follows on the problems inherent in studying women on a freudian model:

   > Freud has had an exceedingly pervasive influence on western civilization. Unfortunately, however, his theoretical generalizations concerning the development and psychological characteristics of girls and women, though laden with rich clinical and theoretical discoveries and achievements, have been significantly flawed by the influence of traditional patriarchal and evolutionary values. This influence is evident in certain questionable presuppositions, logical errors and inconsistencies, suspensions of intensive inquiry, underemphasis on certain developmental variables, and confusions between observations, definitions, and value preferences. Freud was working within a nineteenth-century biological-medical tradition; and he applied and extended the conventions that constituted that tradition. That tradition was marked by a fusion of mechanistic and evolutionary modes of thought and patriarchal complacency. It was based on ruling principles of nature, such as survival; polarities or dichotomies such as activity-passivity and masculinity-feminity; and other broad generalizations designed to take nature by the throat. Additionally, it was a tradition of belief in the idea of value-free empiricism and of pride in the achievements of the utterly objective scientist, and so was philosophically too immature to appreciate what is better established today--namely, the pluralistic, relativistic, linguistic, and inevitably valuative aspects of the various forms of knowledge. Thus, it becomes imperative that we identify and clarify the problematical aspects and limitations of Freud's theoretical contributions to the psychology of women.

   Professor Register, who will work most heavily within the humanities area, remarks about marxism and the difficulties of applying it to women:

> The academic variant of Marxism that is currently popular in a number of European universities has recently begun to appeal to American scholars, particularly the younger generation educated during the period of student activism in the 1960's. Marxist methodology may well be the coming thing, and features challenge the extreme formalism and empiricism that have inhibited previous studies of women. It reestablishes the validity of the cultural context as a referent for interpreting data; it stresses economic determinants of human behavior; it acknowledges the diversity of the population being studied; and it refutes the claim that scholarship can be non-ideological and free of political consequences. However, the theoretical model that Marxist scholarship imposes on the material being studied has some serious weaknesses that limit its applicability to women's studies. It assumes that class membership is the fundamental determinant of social behavior; yet it has had great difficulty assigning class status to women. Class is determined by one's relation to the means of production. Housewives, who perform non-productive services for no wage have no relation to production, so their class status is simply derivative--they marry into it. Because sex is a messy variable in this case, Marxist studies of women are often confined to female wage-workers. Most traditionally female activities are categorized in a "private sphere" that Marxist scholars tend to ignore in favor of analyses of the "public" economic structure. Any attempt to apply Marxist methodology to women's studies must be preceded by a careful feminist analysis of the theoretical model itself.

Finally, Professor Jones, a cultural anthropologist with heavy work in the field of mythology, sees the following limitations within structuralism:

> Although women are active in almost all other areas of research in the social sciences, women "structuralists" are virtually non-existent. The reasons for this abstention are not hard to find. Structural anthropologists, led by C. Levi-Strauss and E.R. Leach, focus almost exclusively on the cognitive aspects of human culture; their chief subject is the "cerebral savage." Historically, a one-sided emphasis on "mind" has almost always been linked to a denigration of female experience, and in anthropology structuralists have reduced women to objects of "nature" to be manipulated by male bearers of "culture." This view of women is not totally untrue. It is simply so one-sided that feminine experience, including female initiative and power, are *a priori* excluded. There are, happily, alternative approaches to human symbol systems which are more compatible with feminist values.

Given this uneasiness amoung feminist scholars about using present methods of research, there emerges a clear need to design new modes of study and reporting of findings. Barbara Dewald, anthropology graduate student with secondary work in philosophy, has this to say about that need:

> The search for any new method of research begins in a confrontation with the history of western philosophy. Existing research methods and techniques have developed out of western notions of

(continue # 12 on next page)

(#12 continued)

> logic and causation which have been extended into formal systems in order to explore the knowable. Linear logic and causative explanation intrinsically set limits on the knowable. Attempts to expand the boundaries of the knowable are frustrated by research strategies which can only contribute data to the extant models. From very early on philosophy has been a male activity, developed, in fact, within the context of an elite male society. It is, therefore,no coincidence that one of the central issues of philosophy is the nature of man, by which is usually meant man, not women and men, as the generous modern interpretation would have us believe. It is necessary to challenge the myth that these male-constructed issues, which are the metaphysic of modern research strategies, are universal, and to recognise that philosophy is a social activity. The doing of philosophy proceeds from how our perception of the world as it is and our understanding of what we want it to be, with theoretical modifications rooted in our sense of what is (really) possible. A new method can be found either only by cutting off or by radically changing the course of the continuing conversation with the Greeks, and by elucidating a new metaphysic.

Materials drawn from the writings by and about Freud, Marx,Levi-Strauss and Leach will be some of the core readings for winter quarter. Discussion will turn around basic assumptions about culture and its inhabitants held by each thinker. In addition, analysis will be made of how the ideas of these men have been adapted into research and thinking within universities and the society as a whole. Students will learn to conduct research using each of these models and then grapple with the process of using such models in trying to answer questions basic to feminist research. By the end of the quarter, they will also have tentative designs from which to structure new methods of research (again both in general and within their particular field of inquiry). During this quarter, students will also become acquainted with present agreement (and disagreement) about what does or might constitute feminist models of research and investigation.

4. Spring Quarter, 1977--The same four faculty and the same (largely) group of students will carry the constructs arrived at during winter quarter into concrete research situations. During this quarter, each student (often working, however, in concert with one or more other students) will design a research project within her/his field. This design will include a summary of the literature already available on the subject chosen, an analysis of which methodological model(s) dominate that research, a statement of what is insufficient about that model(s) when applied to women. The final portion of the design will be a proposal for a research project utilizing principles and practices which by this point in the seminar will have evolved as being feminist. Wherever feasible, students will also conduct a pilot project within their research proposal, testing out hypothses, clarifying procedures, and perhaps even arriving at tentative conclusions.

Materials used will be individualized according to each student's proposal area. However, certain common materials will be looked at, primarily treating the design of research proposals within the social sciences, the humanities, the natural sciences. From the middle of the quarter, students will share their designs and the process of constructing their proposals.

(#12 continued)

The faculty will not only work in weekly seminar meetings, but be available for frequent meetings with individual students or with small groups working on a particular design. The four faculty proposing to teach this seminar have expressed interest in being able to call in additional faculty of students' needs for information and review falls outside their knowledge or expertise. Since Women's Studies already maintains a list of faculty willing to work independently with students, this should be easy enough to do and will be one more strength of the seminar, both for the students and for the faculty asked to assist who can thereby become more immediately aware of what the program is doing for its seniors and more familiar with the whole area of feminist research.

During spring quarter, both Sandra Allen and Andrea Hinding (library and archive resource persons involved in the seminar during fall quarter) will be asked to assist the seminar, this time through helping students research the literature in a chosen area.

An outcome of these proposals will be a report, intended first of all for the seminar members themselves who need to experience "publication" of their work as potential or actual researchers, but also available to various departments and programs (and to individuals upon request) an evidence of the Women's Studies Program's student effort and as aids in understanding the nature and scope of feminist research.

5. Evaluation (June 15-June 30, 1977)--Though evaluation will go on at every stage of the seminar, including an evaluation of the planning time, a thorough evaluation should occur once the total experience is over. Students will play a major role in all stages of evaluation and will offer their overall evaluative help during final examination week of spring quarter. However, we strongly believe that if we are to benefit the most from this experiment, the faculty and staff of the seminar should sit down immediately following the end of spring quarter and do the close and hard evaluations of total design, achievement of broad goals as well as of particular objectives. This group would be expected to turn in to the program their written evaluation as guidance for future seminar leaders and as part of the cumulative evaluation which the program is conducting both for its inner improvement and for the eventual external review by the College of Liberal Arts and the University as a whole through the Regents. The faculty/staff would be joined during these two weeks by representatives of the program's Evaluation Committee and by personnel from Measurement Services Center for consultation in drawing up the final report and as potential questioners about goals, methods, etc. Once again, we have budgeted for some number of these reports to be printed, since we believe that other units within CLA, especially inter-disciplinary programs, will find the evaluations of interest and value to their own efforts.

13. WHAT IMPROVEMENT IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS DO YOU EXPECT TO RESULT FROM THE PROJECT?

Scattered throughout the response to 12 are comments which fit equally under this rubric. But to condense--by team-teaching the senior seminar, thereby achieving continuity, we will improve the educational process within Women's Studies by testing our ideas about this final learning experience for our majors. To know whether the seminar really is (and should be) at the center of our program is crucial to future curricular and budgetary planning. In addition, the presence of the seminar on this campus can have repercussions for a larger educational community. We hope to learn much about interdisciplinary teaching and research methods which could be of interest to similar programs.

As is stated through the steps listed in #12, the program is eager to (and has made financial allowance for) share what is learned (both about subject matter and about the process of learning) with colleagues.

14. HOW DO YOU PLAN TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT?

The effectiveness of the proposed project can be evaluated on several levels. Most simply, the quality of the final research proposals is a primary indication of the success of the year's work. On more complicated levels, we would attempt to determine students' sense of competency as researchers through early, periodic, and final use of scales for competence obtainable from Measurement Services Center and other sources. We will also ask the students, of course, to evaluate both the faculty and the construct for the seminar. The faculty and staff obviously will produce significant commentary on the effectiveness. We also stand a chance for longer-range evaluation, since many of the students in the seminar will continue their education and may enlarge upon and complete their projects at a graduate level. Published articles or project designs, then, will be a later measure of the seminar's effectiveness.

15. IF THIS PROJECT PROVES SUCCESSFUL, HOW WILL THE FACILITIES AND BUDGET OF THE DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE PERMIT ADOPTION OF THE IMPROVED PRACTICE WHEN THE DEVELOPMENT FUNDS HAVE BEEN EXPENDED?

Since the program has from the outset claimed a position of centrality for the senior seminar and since the program committee heartily endorses this proposal and since we currently use a generous share of our small budget to staff the seminar, there is every intention of continuing this format in the future. This will mean diverting funds from some other possible course we could offer, but if this project proves to be as sound as we hope, that diversion is more than justified academically. We would also, naturally, hope that if the college is pleased with the results of our project, that we might secure a small augmentation (e.g. funding for an additional 1/2 FTE Assistant Professor for two quarters) to our annual budget for instruction.

PROPOSER: Toni McNaron
Co-ordinator, Women's Studies Program
492 Ford Hall (373-3508)

TITLE: Planning and Evaluation Grant for development of 3-quarter senior seminar in "Interdisciplinary Feminist Research Methodology".

Faculty/staff teaching the 3-quarter senior seminar, seen as a central interdisciplinary learning experience for our majors, would spend from August 15 to September 15, 1976, working out overall design for the year's course and then spend from June 15 to June 31, 1977, evaluating the first year during which the seminar will have been taught as originally conceived by the Program.

PERIOD OF GRANT: August 15, 1976 to September 15, 1976
June 15, 1977 to June 30, 1977

The senior seminar is a year-long opportunity for our majors to explore, in an interdisciplinary context, what it means to conduct feminist research. The seminar will be team taught, since no single faculty person can be expected to understand methodology for several different kinds of research, e.g., feminist history differs in important research methods from, say, feminist criticism or feminist studies of genetic theories. The four faculty chosen to teach the bulk of the seminar provide a mixture of ranks (Associate Professor to Teaching Associate) and of subject matter focus (psychology, anthropology, classics literature, medical anthropology).

Planning month--This month would allow faculty and staff to work together before classes begin. Because this seminar will involve a number of faculty each quarter, we see this period for pre-planning as even more crucial than usual for new courses. By the beginning of fall quarter, the entire year's program would exist (subject to variations arising from actual classroom work), including the syllabi, structures for class progress, project designs for student research, reading lists and resource bases. The main justification for this month is that since the students served will be the same basic group all year, they will benefit most from a course which has a coherent design in which each work segment reflects overriding objectives and in which all work is based on definable theoretical constructs. Within the emerging field of feminist research, such constructs and coherence are not obtainable from some sourcebook on 'how to conduct research in Women's Studies.' The faculty of this seminar are all persons who have devoted time to the questions of how to carry out and report on feminist research. With this month to sit down and systematically plan the coming year, they and their students will learn more content and do that more s smoothly.

Fall quarter will expose students to definitions of feminist research as presently conceived, to overall goals held in common by feminist scholars, and to the resource bases which contain

PERIOD OF GRANT: Continued

materials necessary to this research. Winter quarter will focus on the process of designing a manageable research project combining feminism and the discipline(s) of the student's choice. By the end of this quarter, students should have researched the literature on their subject, designed their research project, and whereever possible set up a pilot. During both winter and spring, readings and discussion will focus on present methodologies dominating research fields and their advantages and disadvantages when employed by feminist researchers. Spring quarter students will carry out some portion of their design and report results within the seminar.

Evaluation period--Though evaluation will occur at every stage of the seminar, including an evaluation of the planning month, a thorough evaluation should occur once the total experience is over. Students will plan a major role in all stages of this process and will offer their overall evaluative comments during final examination week of spring quarter. However, we strongly believe that if we are to learn the most for future seminars, the faculty and staff should sit down immediately following the year's work and do the close and hard evaluation of total design, achievement of broad goals as well as of particular objectives. The group would turn in their report to the Program as guidance for future seminar leaders and as part of the cumulative evaluation which the Program conducts for its inner improvement and for the University as a whole. The faculty/staff would be joined during these two weeks by the program's own Evaluation Committee as well as by personnel from Measurement Services Center for consultation in drawing up the final report. We have budgeted for a limited distribution of this report, since it seems logical to think that other units within CLA, especially other inter-disciplinary programs, might find the evaluation useful.

BUDGET: Honoraria

I.	Planning Month	$1,850	(for 4 faculty)
II.	Evaluation Period	400	(for 4 faculty)
Supplies			
I.	Duplicating Costs	500	
II.	Report Publication	300	
		$3,050	

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Center for Educational Development
Office of the Vice President, Academic Affairs
317 Walter Library
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-4537

June 9, 1976

Professor Toni McNaron
Co-ordinator
Women's Studies
492 Ford Hall

Dear Professor McNaron:

I am pleased to report that the Council on Liberal Education has agreed to support your request to the Small Grants Program in the amount of $2,850. The approved sum is available now and you may draw against it by preparing the appropriate Business Office forms and forwarding them to my office. We will add the various budget numbers and signatures, and approve for payment. The support is designated as follows: honoraria, $2,250; duplicating, $500; report publication, $100.

I would like to call your attention to the Regents' Policy on University-Sponsored Educational Materials (USEM). If the results of your endeavors under this grant generate interest beyond the University, you will want to take advantage of the conditions of this policy. Copies of the USEM Policy will be printed during Fall Quarter and we will send one to you at that time. Additional information regarding USEM policy may be obtained from: Administrator, University-Sponsored Educational Materials.

At the request of the Council on Liberal Education, I am enclosing a copy of a policy statement of identification of the Small Grants Program as a source of support of your project in communications regarding the project.

I ask that you provide the Center for Educational Development with a project report upon completion of the work.

Sincerely,

Gordon Wm. Kingston

Gordon Wm. Kingston
Assistant Director
Center for Educational Development

GWK:rb

Enclosure

cc: Frank J. Sorauf

APPENDIX B

COURSE SYLLABUS AND HANDOUTS

WOMEN'S STUDIES 3900: SENIOR SEMINAR
Fall Quarter, 1976

Instructors: Etta Magnusen, Judy Wanhala, Gayle Graham Yates

Course requirements: Each student will prepare a seminar project, either a research project, a creative project, or a social service project, which would be reported in a paper. The student will present the project in two ways: 1)present it orally to the class for an hour in a class session of the last half of the quarter, 2)turn in at the last meeting of class a finished paper on the project, the paper being 10-15 pages typewritten or its equivalent for a creative project or a report on a social service project.

Each student is expected to actively participate in class sessions.

Each student is expected to attend the weekly Wednesday noon Bag Lunch Seminars of the Women's Studies Program.

Meetings: The class will meet for a two-hour period once a week at a time the instructors and students can agree upon.

Rough schedule:
Session 1--Introductions, orientation
Assignment for next time: Write a two or three paragraph, not more than one typewritten page, statement of your own feminist perspective for doing Women's Studies to be shared with the class at the next meeting.
Session 2--Feminist Perspectives
Reading assignment: Howe, Florence, ed., Women and the Power to Change, at least Part 1, "Toward a Woman-Centered University," by Adrienne Rich, and Part 4, "Women and the Power to Change," by Florence Howe. Optional reading: Hochschild, "Inside the Clockwork of Male Careers," and Wallach, "A View from the Law School."
Session 3--Feminist Literature--Judy Wanhala and interested students leading. Reading assignment: Woolf, Virginia, A Room of One's Own
Session 4--Feminist History--Gayle Graham Yates and interested students leading. Reading assignment: Flexner, Eleanor, Century of Struggle
Session 5--Library Research--Sandra Allen, at the library
Session 6--Archival Research--Andrea Hinding, at the Social Welfare History Archives
Session 7--Counseling and Therapy from a Feminist Perspective--Etta Magnusen and interested students leading
Session 8--Student presentations
Session 9--Student presentations
Session 10--Student presentations
Session 11--Student presentations
Student projects due in final form

Senior Seminar--Winter, 1977

Time: T,Th 11:15-12:30

Place: 50 Ford Hall

Instructors: Barbara Dewald, Teaching Assistant, Anthropology, 254 Ford Hall
Pat Faunce, Associate Professor, Psychology, Measurement Services, 9 Clarence Ave. S.E.
Jennette Jones, Instructor, Anthropology, Extension
Cheri Register, Assistant Professor, Women's Studies, 488 Ford Hall

Jan. 4 Introduction to course

Jan. 6 Discussion of interests, expectations, potential problems--transition from fall quarter. Write up a list of principles you think a feminist methodology ought to adhere to. Bring themes to suggest for spring quarter research.

Jan. 11 The Scientific Background (Barbara Dewald)

Jan. 13 The Rise of Social Science (Barbara)
Read selections from Geertz, Interpretation of Cultures (photocopy)

Jan. 18 Sociology of Science (Barbara)

Jan. 20 Discussion of preceding three sessions (Barbara)

Jan. 25 Feminist Anthropology (Jennette Jones)
Read Rosaldo and Lamphere, Women, Culture and Society and Sally Stocum, "Man the Hunter" (photocopy)

Jan. 27 Field Research: Theories and Methods (Jennette)
Read selections from Peggy Gold, Women in the Field (photocopy)
Write a 2-page paper, topic to be arranged.

Feb. 1 Literary Criticism: Methods in Use (Cheri Register)
Read selections from the packet of photocopied articles on feminist criticism

Feb. 3 Defining Feminist Literary Criticism (Cheri)
Write a 2-page paper that either: a) outlines what you think is essential to a feminist literary criticism, b) outlines a possible feminist approach to a particular literary work or body of work, c) discusses the implications of a feminist study of literature for your own discipline.

Feb. 8	Introduction to Jungian Psychology (Jennette) Read selections from C. G. Jung, *Man and His Symbols*, to be assigned.
Feb. 10	Applications of Jungian Psychology (Jennette) Write a 2-page paper, topic to be arranged.
Feb. 13	Introduction to Academic Marxism (Cheri) Read selections from Tom Bottomore, *Karl Marx*, to be assigned.
Feb. 17	Marxist-Feminist Methodology (Cheri) Read Alice Kessler-Harris, "Women, Work, and the Social Order" (photocopy) and at least one other article from the bibliography of Marxist articles. Write a 2-page paper that either: a) discusses how a Marxist-feminist scholar might approach the research topic you have in mind for spring quarter, or b) outline the methodology used in one of the articles you read.
Feb. 22	Biases and Problems in the Behavioral and Social Sciences (Pat Faunce). Readings to be assigned for Feb. 22, 24 and Mar. 1, 3 from packet of photocopied articles.
Feb. 24	Biases and Problems--continued (Pat)
Mar. 1	Biases and Problems--continued (Pat)
Mar. 3	Biases and Problems--continued (Pat) Write a 4-5 page paper covering highlights and trends in the articles read.
Mar. 8	Summary, Gap-Filling, Loose-End Tying. Turn in your research proposal for spring quarter, plus a one-paragraph abstract of it.
Mar. 10	Summary, Course Evaluation

Barbara Dewald, November 1976

concept
paradigm
framework
epistemological
teleology
explanation
causation
prediction
retrodiction
functional
structural
methods
methodology
(testable) hypothesis
observation
positivism
models
bias
deductive
inductive
holistic
historicism
scientistic
value
value-free
analytical
inference
Wm of Occam
Newton
Darwin
Einstein
Whitehead
Reichenback

time
empirical/empiricist
idealist
mentalist
typological
law
operational/operationalise
fact
truth
free will
determinism
intersubjective
quantification
probability
objectivity
neutrality
normative
normal science
generalization
meaning
interpretation
context
ideology
law of nature
historical determinism
isomorphism
sociology of knowledge
reductionism
patterns
phenomenology
human nature
subjectivity
verstehen

*Philosophy of Social Science, Richard S. Rudner
*Philosophy of Natural Science, Carl Hempel
Aspects of Scientific Explanation, Carl Hempel
An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science, Rudolf Carnap
Science and the Modern World, Alfred North Whitehead
Scientific Knowledge and Sociological Theory, Barry Barnes
Patterns of Discovery, Norwood Hanson
Social Processes of Scientific Development, ed. by Richard Whitley
The Conduct of Enquiry, Abraham Kaplan
*1st chapter in Geertz' Interpretation of Cultures
article by Jeremy Boissevain: "Towards a Sociology of Social Anthropology" in
Theory and Society 1(2):211-230. (I have a xerox)
The Structure of Scientific Revolution, Thomas Kuhn

Women's Studies Jan. 27, 1977

SENIOR SEMINAR, Winter 1977

SECTION ON FEMINIST ANTHROPOLOGY: For next Tuesday, Feb. 1, please read all of these articles from Rosaldo and Lamphere, Women, Culture, and Society, listed below, and be prepared to discuss them in class. In addition, choose one topic and write a short (two-page) paper on that topic. All papers will be read and commented on, and some will be read and discussed in class on Tuesday. If you don't connect with any of the topics listed below, please write your own question and answer it, preferably sticking to these readings (so that we'll have a common basis for discussion) and focusing on the general theme of feminist methodology, or feminist assumptions in anthropology.

1. What is the relation of domestic organization to female power? What is the point of view of each author? How do they differ with respect to methodology and conclusion?
READ: Lamphere, pp. 97ff., Friedl (xeroxed article, "The Position of Women: Appearance and Reality"), Wolf 157ff., Stack 113ff.)

2. Compare Sanday and Sacks with respect to their basic assumptions about culture, basic assumptions about women, their methodologies (theoretical approach and research methods), and conclusions.
READ: Sanday 189ff., Sacks 113 ff.

3. What is the relation of ideology about women (within a culture) to the realities of female power? Are symbolic power and social power related directly? or inversely? or other?
READ: Bamberger 263ff., Paul 281ff., O'Laughlin 301ff., Ortner 67ff.

4. What assumptions about women (if any) are shared by the anthropologists whose articles are listed above? Or do they make assumptions which can be classified as to type? Explain.

5. What general approaches to the study of culture and society are represented in the articles listed above? (You may list in outline form.) Which of these approaches seems most compatible with the goals of feminist research? Explain.

LITERARY CRITICISM: METHODS IN USE

I. Textual, Formalist Methods

- A. New Criticism
  Cleanth Brooks, The Well-Wrought Urn
  Hints: explication, image patterns, the integrity of the text, art for art's sake

- B. Neo-Aristotelian Aesthetic Criticism
  "The Chicago School," Aristotle's Poetics
  Hints: the three unities, catharsis, hero, tragedy

- C. Structuralism
  Robert Scholes, Structuralism in Literature
  Hints: Semiotics, signs, morphology, encoding/decoding

II. Textual-Psychological Methods

- A. Freudian Criticism
  Hints: dream imagery, psychobiography

- B. Archetypal Criticism
  Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism
  Hints: Jungian, archetype, universal, myth, hero

III. Contextual Methods

- A. Literary History
  Hints: periods, trends, chronology, schools of thought

- B. Literary Sociology
  Ian Wett, The Rise of the Novel
  Hints: production, environment

- C. Historical-Biographical Criticism
  Taine, Sainte-Beuve
  Hints: race, milieu, epoch

- D. Marxist Criticism
  Georg Lukacs, Frederic Jameson
  Hints: materialism, ideology, social reality

IV. Reader-Oriented Criticism

- A. Impressionism
  Virginia Woolf, The Common Reader

- B. Literary Sociology
  Hints: distribution, reception, mass media

- C. Reader Response (Subjective) Criticism

Name ______________________

READER SURVEY

1. List 3 to 5 literary works that you have read that you would call "good" from a feminist point of view. Explain briefly why you have listed each of them.

2. Are there any works that have been recommended to you for their feminist value that you have been disappointed with? Why were you disappointed?

3. What part does feminism play in your choice of material for reading in your free time?

4. Is there any existing method of literary criticism that you favor?

5. Imagine that you are going to write either: a) a pathbreaking feminist literary work, b) a feminist literary work that will be translated into 12 languages, or c) the greatest feminist literary work of all time. What will it be like?

6. Do you have your own quickie definition of "feminist?" of "literature?"

Return to: Cheri Register, Women's Studies Program, 492 Ford Hall, University
of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

FEMINIST LITERARY CRITICISM: Some places to start

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Damon, Gene, et. al. The Lesbian in Literature.

Meyers, Carol F. Women and Literature. 1976. (in Wilson Reserve)

Williams, Ora. Black Women in Arts and Sciences.

The Women and Literature Collective. Women and Literature: An Annotated Bibliography of Women Writers. 1976.

JOURNALS

Aphra -- feminist literary magazine

Feminist Studies

Women's Studies

BOOKS

Bernikow, Louise. The World Split Open. (introduction)

Cornillon, Susan Koppelman (ed.). Images of Women in Fiction: Feminist Perspectives. 1972. -- anthology of critical articles.

Donovan, Josephine. Feminist Literary Criticism: Explorations in Theory. 1975.

Ellmann, Mary. Thinking About Women. 1968.

Juhasz, Suzanne. Naked and Fiery Forms. 1976. -- on women poets.

Millett, Kate. Sexual Politics. 1969.

Moers, Ellen. Literary Women: The Great Writers. 1976.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. The Female Imagination. 1975.

Woolf, Virginia. A Room of One's Own. 1929.

ARTICLES

Auerbach, Nina. "Austen and Alcott on Matriarchy," *Novel*, Fall 1976.

Douglas, Ann. "'The Scribbling Women' and Fanny Fern: Why Women Wrote," *American Quarterly*, Spring 1971.

Greene, Elsa. "Emily Dickinson was a Poetess," *College English*, October 1972.

Kolodny, Annette. "Some Notes on Defining a 'Feminist Literary Criticism,'" *Critical Inquiry*, II:1 (Autumn), 1975.

Martin, Wendy. "Seduced and Abandoned in the New World," in *Woman in Sexist Society*, V. Gornick and B. Moran, eds.

Ohmann, Carol, "Emily Brontë in the Hands of Male Critics," *College English*, October 1971.

Olsen, Tillie. "Silences: When Writers Don't Write," *Harper's Magazine*, October, 1965.

Ozick, Cynthia. "Women and Creativity: The Demise of the Dancing Dog," in *Woman in Sexist Society*, V. Gornick and B. Moran, eds.

Pratt, Annis. "The New Feminist Criticism," *College English*, May 1971.

"Archetypal Approaches to the New Feminist Criticism," *Bucknell Review*, 21:1 (Spring).

Robinson, Lillian. "Dwelling in Decencies," *College English*, May 1971.

Showalter, Elaine. "Women and the Literary Curriculum," *College English*, May 1971. (A very convincing rationale for studying women's literature. Arguments apply equally well to other areas of women's studies.)

2. "Women Writers and the Double Standard," in *Woman in Sexist Society*, V. Gornick and B. Moran, eds.

3. "Killing the Angel in the House," *Antioch Review*, 32:3 (June).

4. "Review Essay: Literary Criticism," *Signs*, 1:2 (Winter).

Sudran, Jean. "Hearth and Horizon: Changing Concepts of the 'Domestic' Life of the Heroine," *Massachusetts Review*, Spring, 1973.

Toth, Emily. "The Independent Woman and 'Free Love,'" *Massachusetts Review*, Fall 1975.

WoSt 3900
Winter 1977

Assigned topics for paper on Jung, Feb. 17.

Choose one Jungian concept (archetypes, "the feminine," the animus/anima, reality of the psyche, etc.) and indicate how it supports or contradicts a feminist perspective. (2 pages)

WoSt Senior Seminar
Winter 1977

Bibliography on Marxist Approaches

Bammer, Angelika. "Toward a Feminist-Marxist Criticism," paper presented at Midwest Modern Language Association, November 1976.

Bernow, S. S. and Raskin, P. D. "Ecology of Scientific Consciousness," Telos, 28:125-143.

Binstock, Jeanne. "Metamorphosis of the Mother," Dissent, 20, Fall 1973.

Blanchard, Margaret. "Socialisation in Mrs. Dalloway," College English, 34:2, November 1972.

Bridenthal, Renate. "The Dialectics of Production and Reproduction in History," Radical America, 10(2), March/April 1976.

Brown, Judith. "Economic Organisation and the Position of Women Among the Iroquois," Ethnohistory, 17:15-167. A slightly different version of this paper appears in Reiter (1975) below.

Dahlerup, Pil. "Theoretical Problems in Analysing the Literary Works of Woman Authors," paper presented at Feminology Symposium, Netherlands, June 1975.

Davies, Margery. "Woman's Place is at the Typewriter: The Feminization of the Clerical Labor Force," Radical America, 8(4), 1974.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and English, Dierdre. Complaints and Disorders: The Sexual Politics of Sickness. 1973.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. "Speech at the National Conference on Socialist Feminism," Socialist Revolution, 26, Oct/Dec 1975.

George, Margaret. "From 'Goodwife' to 'Mistress': The Transformation of the Female in Bourgeois Culture," Science and Society, 37(2), Summer 1973.

Gordon, Linda. "A Socialist View of Women's Studies," Signs, I:2, Winter 1975.

Gordon, Ann D., et. al. "Women in American Society: An Historical Contribution," Radical America, 5(4), July/Aug 1971.

Kessler-Harris, Alice. "Women, Work, and the Social Order," in Berenice Carroll's Liberating Women's History, 1976.

Leacock, Eleanor. "Introduction" to Engels' *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, pp. 7-67, 1972.

O'Laughlin, Bridget. "Marxist Approaches in Anthropology," *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 4, 1975.

Mitchell, Juliet. *Woman's Estate*. 1971.

Phelps, Linda. "Patriarchy and Capitalism," *Quest*, II:2, Fall 1975.

Reiter, Rayna, ed. *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. 1975. This collection has several articles which consider the position of women from a materialist perspective.

Robinson, Lillian and Vogel, Lise. "Modernism and History," in Cornillon, *Images of Women in Fiction*. 1972.

Rowbotham, Sheila. *Woman's Consciousness, Man's World* (1973) and *Women, Resistance and Revolution*.

Sacks, Karen. "Engels Revisited: Women, the Organisation of Production, and Private Property," in Rosaldo and Lamphere, *Woman, Culture and Society*. 1974.

Scholte, Bob. "Toward a Reflexive Anthropology," in Dell Hymes' *Reinventing Anthropology*. 1972.

Shor, Ira. "Notes on Marxism and Method" and "Questions Marxists Ask About Literature," *College English*, 34(2), November 1972.

Shorter, Edward. "Female Emancipation, Birth Control, and Fertility in European History," *American Historical Review*, 78, June 1973.

Vogel, Lise. "Fine Arts and Feminism: The Awakening Consciousness," *Feminist Studies*, II:1.

Women's Work Study Group. "Loom, Broom and Womb: Producers, Maintainers, and Reproducers," *Radical America*, 10:2, March/April 1976.

Zaretsky, Eli. Series on the Family, *Socialist Revolution*, III: 13, 13, 15 and IV: 1.

Journals in which to find more articles:

New Left Review, *Science and Society*, *Minnesota Review*, *Radical America*,

Socialist Revolution, *Dissent*, *Women: A Journal of Liberation*, *Quest*, *Clio*.

Senior Seminar
Winter 1977

READING AND THINKING ASSIGNMENT FOR FEB. 22

READ: Introduction to Tom Bottomore, Karl Marx, plus Isaiah Berlin's essay on Historical Materialsim

NOTE: Our discussion on Tuesday will not focus on Marxism as a political stance or a source of strategy. We will back up a step or two and look at it as a worldview--a way of explaining the world and what happens in it--in other words, as an analytical tool.

WRITE: A list of the basic concepts introduced. (e.g. Words like "superstructure," "dialectic" may recur and can be read as key words for basic Marxist concepts.) Once you have a list of such words, check back in the text and see whether they are defined and how they are used. Please bring your list of words to class to contribute to our collective list of Marxist concepts. Much of our class time on Tuesday will probably be spent clarifying these and trying to make some tentative connections between them and feminist concepts.

THINK: Set yourself an imaginary task. Imagine that you want to explain something, for example: 1) Why Kate Chopin wrote what she did in The Awakening, 2) Why the nuclear family is the major kinship unit in the U.S., 3) Why homosexuality is taboo in our culture, 4) Why women were shamans in pagan Scandinavia, 5) Why it's so hard to get off AFDC, 6) Why women gobble up Gothic novels, 7) Why hard, outlandish, sexist, electric rock music is so popular right now . . . . Whatever's on your mind.

TRY: Once you've got your problem selected, try to imagine how you would apply each of the concepts on your list to it. Do they suggest any direction that your attempt to explain whatever it is you want to explain should take? You may get frustrated at this point (if you aren't already), but, nevertheless, this exercise should help you come to a more precise understanding of how a Marxist-feminist method can be used.

HELP: I would be very grateful if people who have had some background in Marxism would pitch in and help me clarify some of these concepts. I am not the world's greatest living expert on what Marx really said. I might ask you to do something more extensive the second day when we zero in on Marxist-feminism a little more.

BIASES AND PROBLEMS IN THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

WoSt 3900: Senior Seminar
Winter '77, P. S. Faunce

A. HISTORY/BACKGROUND: SOME VIEWS AS TO WHY AND WHERE PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY ARE NOW WITH REGARD TO WOMEN (Tuesday, March 1)

Shields, Stephanie A. "Functionalism, Darwinism, and the Psychology of Women: A Study in Social Myth." American Psychologist, 1975, Vol. 30, No. 7, 739-754.

Shields, Stephanie A. "Ms. Pilgrim's Progress: The Contributions of Leta Stetter Hollingworth to the Psychology of Women." American Psychologist, 1975, Vol. 30, No. 8, 852-857.

Freud, Sigmund. "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes." International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1927, 8, 133-142. (Also in Rhoda Kesler Unger, and Florence L. Denmark (Eds.), Woman: Dependent or Independent Variable? New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc., 1975, 126-136.)

Walstead, Joyce Jennings. "The Anatomy of Oppression: A Feminist Analysis of Psychotherapy." KNOW, Inc.: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15221, 1971.

Hill, Jack W. "Selling Women Short: A Psychiatrists' View." Unpublished manuscript, Grand Rapids, Michigan, n.d.

Fields, Rona M. "Psychotherapy: The Sexist Machine." KNOW, Inc., reprint, 1-11.

Doherty, May Austin. "Sexual Bias in Personality Theory." The Counseling Psychologist, 1973, Vol. 4, No. 1, 67-74. (Library)

Weisstein, Naomi. "Psychology Constructs the Female or The Fantasy Life of the Male Psychologist." 1971, MSS Modular Publications, Inc., reprint.

Silveira, Jeanette. "The Effects of Sexism on Thought: How Male Bias Hurts Psychology and Some Hopes for a Woman's Psychology." KNOW, Inc., reprint.

Bart, Pauline B. "Sexism and Social Science: From the Gilded Cage to the Iron Cage or the Perils of Pauline." KNOW, Inc., reprint.

Broverman, Inge K., Broverman, Donald H., Clarkson, Frank, E., Rosenkrantz, Paul S., and Vogel, Susan R. "Sex-Roles Stereotypes and Clinical Judgments of Mental Health." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, Vol. 34, No. 1, 1-7.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. "A Review of Sex Role Research." American Journal of Sociology, Jan., 1973, Vol. 78, No. 4, 1011-1029. (Library)

Bernard, Jessie. "Sex Differences: An Overview." MSS Modular Publications, Inc., reprint.

B. CURRENT STATUS OF PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

1. ISSUES WITH REGARD TO WOMEN (Thursday, March 3)

Parlee, Mary Brown. "Psychology." SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, Autumn, 1975, Vol. 1, No. 1, 119-138.

Mednick, Martha T. Shuch, and Weissman, Hilda J. "The Psychology of Women -- Selected Topics." Annual Review of Psychology, 1975, Vol. 26, 1-18.

Bem, Sandra L. "Psychology Looks at Sex Roles: Where Have the Androgynous People Gone?" Stanford University, unpublished manuscript.

American Psychological Association. "Report of the Task Force on Sex Bias and Sex-Role Stereotyping in Psychotherapeutic Practice." American Psychologist, December, 1975, Vol. 30, No. 12, 1169-1175.

Cox, Sue. "A Feminist View of the Psychology of Women." Female Psychology: The Emerging Self, Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1976, 3-7.

Brodsky, Annette M. "The Psychologist's Role in Women's Studies." Teaching of Psychology, 1975, Vol. 2, No. 2, 69-72.

Beuf, Ann H. "Women's Studies Programs: Strengths, Weaknesses, and the Psychologist's Role." Paper presented at American Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, September 3, 1975.

Torrey, Jane W. "Psychoanalysis: A Feminist Revision." KNOW, Inc., reprint, 1971, 1-5.

Huber, Joan. "Sociology: Review Essay." SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1976, Vol. 1, No. 3, 635-697.

2. SPECIFIC ISSUES WITH REGARD TO RESEARCH (Tuesday, March 8)

Jahoda, Marie, and Havel, Joan. "Psychological Problems of Women in Different Social Roles: A Case History of Problem Formulation in Research." Educational Record, October, 1955, 325-335. (Library)

Carlson, Earl R., and Carlson, Rae. "Male and Female Subjects in Personality Research." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, Vol. 16, No. 3, 482-483. (Library)

Reardon, Patrice, and Prescott, Suzanne. "Re-examination of Male Versus Female Representation in Psychological Research." MS. 1236 JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1976, 6(1).

Rosenthal, Robert; Mulry, Ray C.; Persinger, Gordon W.; Vikan-Kline, Linda; and Grothe, Mardell. "Emphasis on Experimental Procedure, Sex of Subjects and the Biasing Effects of Experimental Hypotheses." Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1964, Vol. 28, 470-473. (Library)

Epstein, Yakov M.; Suedfeld, Peter; and Silverstein, Stanley J. "The Experimental Contract: Subjects' Expectations of and Reactions to Some Behaviors of Experimenters." American Psychologist, March, 1973, Vol. 28, No. 3, 212-221. (Library)

Alper, Thelma G. "Achievement Motivation in College Women: A Now-You-See-It-Now-You-Don't Phenomenon." American Psychologist, March, 1974, Vol. 29, No. 3, 194-203.

Birk, Janice M. "Interest Inventories: A Mixed Blessing." The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, June, 1974, Vol. 22, No. 4, 280-286. (Library)

Oliver, Laurel W. "Counseling Implications of Recent Research on Women." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1975, Vol. 53, No. 6, 430-437.

- -

C. WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT (Thursday, March 10)

Write a 4-5 page paper covering highlights and trends in the articles read.

WoSt 3900, Senior Seminar, W '77

Guidelines of Putting Together a Project Proposal

I. State the topic--by title or short description.

II. Explain how this topic fits into the overall theme of "Women, Culture and Power"--in a paragraph or so.

III. Explain the value of this project to women's studies and/or the women's movement--as much space as you need.

IV. Describe what has previously been done in this area, and evaluate that from a feminist/androgynist/whatever point of view (i.e., your point of view)--this does not need to be exhaustive, a general summary will do.

V. Describe your method, that is, how you intend to proceed with the project--about one page.

VI. List the resources you intend to use.

For example: book titles, archival sources, census records, activities to be observed, people you plan to interview, audio-visual materials--whatever is appropriate to your project.

This is to be a "working" resource list. That means you do not actually have to consult the sources before you list them. You may later find that some of them are inappropriate, but for now that doesn't matter. This is just a sketch of where you plan to begin.

Length of this section depends on the kind of project you choose.

The final proposal should be about three or four pages long. Please include with it, on a separate sheet of paper, a one-paragraph abstract of the proposal. This will be dittoed and handed out to the class. Please decide fairly soon whom you would like to consult with for advice, guidance, reactions, etc. Team projects are welcome!

Proposals are due March 8th.

Introductory Statement: This was prepared by the team of students responsible for facilitating one of the class discussions on The Second Sex.

The purpose of this section is not to proclaim any eternal qualities of a feminine archetype but rather "to describe the common basis that underlies every individual feminine existence". Section V examines how women experience their situations: marriage, motherhood, prostitution, old age. We would like to use the general concepts of transcendence/immanence, subject/object, independence/dependence, freedom/oppression and self/other.

THE MARRIED WOMAN

In this section de Beauvoir explains how the institution of marriage rather than individual marital situations serves to keep women from transcendence. She says that marriages are not, generally, founded upon love and that marraige is intended to suppress woman's erotic life which is contrary to the myths used to support the institution of marriage. Housewifery further routinizes the married woman's existence. De Beauvoir sees the key to marriages that "go well" as compromise which leads to boredom, but she sees more marriages of the type of pitiable union in which the spouses despise each other yet cling to one another. To free the married woman from her slave status, de Beauvoir requires that love be free, tha[illegible]pouses should not be regarded as a unit, that economic independence is[illegible]sential, and that marriage cannot be a career for women.

Question: : How does de Beauvoir use the idea that women are offered happiness--rather than love--in marriage to substantiate her claim that marriage limits women to immanence?

Unfamiliar terms:	fin de siecle, p. 490
	roman domina, p. 501
	joie de vivre, p. 505
	ennui, p. 512

THE MOTHER

In this chapter, Simone de Beauvoir describes some of the aspects of motherhood: pregnancy, childbirth, infancy, childhood, and adolscence.

The notion that maternity is the destiny of women which will result in happy, self-fulfillment is a deception because "an outward event cannot justify or rennovate women's lives". Thus, maternity offers only the illusion of transcendence. A woman cannot transcend through a child -- "only the child...as an independent being can transcend; when she lays a stake on his future, her transcendence through the universe and time is by proxy which is to say once more she is doomed to dependency." De Beauvoir does suggest that contraception and legal abortion allows women to undertake their maternities in freedom and allows women to transcend biology. The role of mother is not isolated from a woman's total life but is connected to other roles such as wife or prostitute.

Concept and vocabulary: transcendence, immanence, fecundity

SOCIAL LIFE

It is very important that women tend to themselves and dress their bodies for display. "The better showing a woman makes, the more she is respected," and at parties women are flaunted as men's property. Friendship is used for affirmation of the feminine world women belong to; it is also used to build a kind of moral code for the female sex to replace the male code that is not theirs. Women need each other as a relief from play-acting with men, which they must do to continue the facade of true women-hood; however, they often see each other as the enemy because other women are a threat to their key to the world -- men. Marriage denies women liberty and individuality of feeling, but adultery is prohibited by society because of (1) the risk of bringing the son of a stranger into the family, and (2) the fact that the wife is the husband's property.

Questions: Wha~~t~~y has the toilette been so important to women?
What class of women does de Beauvoir seem to be refering to?

Vocabulary: toilette

PROSTITUTES AND HETAIRAS

Prostitution is a scapegoat: man vents his baseness on woman and then he rejects her. To avoid rough treatment, prostitutes need a man. Many begin their careers in love with one man, then slip into prostitution when the initial relationship(s) fails. Prostitutes also need each other to form a counter-universe to regain some human dignity. The lot of the common prostitute is misery--they are exploited sexually and economically, subjected to police and medical supervision as well as the caprices of customers, and doomed to disease and, often, early death.

The hetaira works to gain recognition for herself as an individual -- she plays the Woman ideal for man in exchange for wealth and fame. Her person seems to her a gift to humanity. Hetairas treat not only their bodies but their entire personalities as capital to be exploited.

Questions: Although marriage and prostitution are, according to de Beauvoir, directly correlated, what sets the wife apart from the prostitute?

How does the hetaira, if need be, justify herself morally?

Vocabulary: hetaira, defloration, nihilism, Neitzscheism

FROM MATURITY TO OLD AGE

In the acceptance of her old age, woman for the first time in her life can possess real power, but it is too late for her to use it in most cases. De Beauvoir says that the older woman finding herself in there circumstances often channels her frustrations to her grown children by trying to live through them or by trying to hamper them. She occupies herself with activities that merely kill time and cause her to fall back into vain immanence. The woman in old age often begins to see her own reality, but her wisdom (as well as her unity with other women) is of a negative nature. At this stage of life woman has the knowledge, but not the means, to achieve transcendence.

> Question: : What kinds of freedom or power are permissible for the older woman that are denied to younger women? How do the divergent types of roles of each age group serve to limit the capability to transcend for all women?

WOMAN"S SITUATION AND CHARACTER

This chapter is a summary of women's situation and its effects on her character and her behaviors. De Beauvoir suggests that woman's behavior and character, that is, her immanence, is not biologically predetermined but is the result of her situations. Some of the ideas presented in this part are:

(1) Relation of immanence to time
(2) Traits: resignation, submission, resentment (as the reverse side of dependence), "animal nature"
(3) Life directed toward means such as food, shelter, clothing rather than ends. (The means are inessential intermediaries between animal life and free existence); life tied to perishable things.
(4) Behavior: tears, religion, search for matriarchy, ambivalence about body and about nature. In some ways these behaviors are attempts to gain transcendence.

Concepts and terms: inessential, essential, gynaeceum

WoSt 3900
Senior Seminar
Spring 1977

Assignment for May 12

I. Write up a short (one-paragraph) evaluation of your own performance as a discussion leader. Some questions to consider: What did you intend to do in class? What did you want to happen? How did you prepare? Did things go the way you'd planned? Why or why not? Were you comfortable in your role? How would you do it if you had it to do over again?

If you have comments you'd like to offer other people in class, please write them up, too.

II. Come to class prepared to make a 5-minute statement about The Second Sex, answering one of the following questions:

1. What do you think of Beauvoir's methodology?
2. What types of power does The Second Sex deal with?
3. How does women's otherness make us powerful and/or powerless?
4. Has The Second Sex contributed anything to your own project? What?
5. Which section or idea do you consider most important for Women's Studies and why?
6. Is there any point at which you clearly disagree with Beauvoir? Why?
7. Make up your own question about The Second Sex and answer it--but please tell us what the question is.

Please keep your comments focussed on the text, and be as precise as possible. Any statement that could have been written without reading the book will be considered worthless. If for some reason (legitimate, of course) you can't come to class on May 12, please write up your statement and turn it in.

GUIDELINES FOR PROJECTS

Each of you will have 35 minutes for the presentation. Please take care to limit your material to something that can easily be covered in 35 minutes. If you want reactions from the class, allow for that in your preparations. You will be responsible for watching the clock yourself. There won't be any umpire to call time on you when you hit 35 minutes. No matter how earthshaking your project may be, there's no justification for encroaching on the time of the person who follows you.

Class will start at 11:15 sharp. Please be on time.

Please check in with your advisor once more before your presentation.

If you want to hand out some written material, you are welcome to use the Women's Studies ditto machine. Ask Patti Halling for ditto masters. She will also help you run the machine if you don't know how.

If you need audio-visual equipment, tell Cheri well ahead of time.

If you want to recommend readings to do before your presentation, please write them on the board a week or so before your turn comes up.

You are required to evaluate the presentations of the other people in class. A short paragraph for each will do. Please write them on only one side of the paper so we can cut and paste them for distribution. We discussed some possible criteria in class one day and came up with these:

1. Competence--how well she knows her subject and material.
2. Analysis and interpretation--whether she goes beyond simply accumulating data and makes some attempt to look critically at what she's found.
3. Significance--is the problem important?
4. Thoroughness--how well-researched or well-thought-out the project is.
5. Relation to the theme of Women, Culture and Power (please include in your presentation some statement that puts your project into that context and explains how you see its relevance to Women, Culture and Power.)
6. Delivery--how well she speaks, how clearly she explains herself, etc.

If you have suggestions for further work, add those to the evaluation. You don't have to limit yourself to these criteria--they are just suggestions.

The written form of the project is due June 2. Please type!

APPENDIX C

ABSTRACTS OF STUDENT PROJECTS

ABSTRACTS OF SENIOR SEMINAR PROJECTS, SPRING 1977

Shelley Anderson, "Women's Emerging Spirituality"

From readings and from interviewing women active in religious reform and in the women's movement, I will attempt to answer some of the following questions: a) in exactly what ways do established religions oppress women? b) in exactly what ways do established religions liberate women? c) is women's spirituality a source of political power? d) can Judaism and Christianity (the two religions I will focus on) be reformed or should women attempt to establish/discover new ways of religious experience? What kind of rituals, images, and 'theology' are women creating?

Ann Boerth, "Prostitution"

My project will explore the subject of prostitution in the United States. After completing my research and employing an interdisciplinary approach, I would like to form conclusions regarding the power these women feel they hold and the power which society attributes and denies to them. In trying to answer these questions, I will be examining the cultural images of the women and the cultural life within prostitution. I am particularly interested in what a feminist perspective might be in relation to this issue and also in the periods when prostitutes have collectively united for power.

Susan David, "Childbirth"

My project will consist of a paper and a slide show (the slide show to be presented in class) showing the gradual loss of power by women over their own reproductive functions. I'll show how birth was managed historically, how it changed with the intervention of men and how some people today are trying to put the power back where it belongs--in the capable hands of women.

Mary Jo Dobson, "The Power of Androgyny--An Exploration of Virginia Woolf's Orlando"

My project will be an analysis of Virginia Woolf's book Orlando from my perspective as a reader. The focus of the research will be on Woolf's fictional representation of the concept of androgyny and her treatment of her fictional characters in regard to personality traits, behavior, experiences, and relationships.

Sharleen Goldberg, "The Wedding Industry"

My hypothesis is that the wedding industry limits women's options by coercing them to conform to traditional female roles. The wedding industry is a part of our culture which I believe actively promotes the continuation of stereotypically feminine roles by its image of the bride as passive, dependent, pure, ladylike, etc. The exploration of how this imagery is imposed upon women and perpetuates the conceptualization of women as subordinates through the wedding industry's idealization of the bride as a role for women to aspire to and glory in will be conducted by analyzing the wedding industry's messages in magazines. My contention is that these messages from the wedding industry serve to diminish women's power to choose non-traditional roles.

Jan Karpel, "Women's Collectives in the Twin Cities"

My project will be to interview three collectives. W.A.R.M., Twin Cities Women's Film Collective and Circle of the Witch. I will be approaching my project from an analysis of goals, structures and transformation. Primarily, why were the collectives first formed, what is their structure now, how are they developing, what transformation have they undergone and where are they going? A primary question in this study for me is--are the collectives historically a mechanism for survival in the patriarchal art establishment? (Editor's Note: This project was not completed.)

Kathy Knutson, "Female Juvenile Offenders"

Sex-based discrimination occurs in many institutions in the U.S., and the juvenile criminal justice system is no exception. The definition of juvenile delinquency demonstrates cultural, societal, and moral value judgments about what appropriate behavior for juvenile females should be, and results in sexist and chauvinist interpretations of delinquency for females, as differentiated from males. The treatment and adjudication of female juveniles at various points within the juvenile justice system demonstrates the ambiguity and injustice inherent in the definition of female policemen, and the general public. Through observation, interviews, and library research, I hope to delineate some of the aspects of this discriminatory definition, and the implications it has for the female juvenile delinquent, and her powerlessness in the face of the juvenile justice system.

Gail Plewacki/Kathy MacKenzie, "The Elizabeth Blackwell Women's Health Center"

The Elizabeth Blackwell Women's Center was established in February, 1974 by a collective of women wishing to do something about the problems confronting women in relation to their health care needs. We will be working with them to define a target population, assess the needs of those women, and develop and execute programs which will help community women deal with the health care system. We will keep journals in which we will log our activities and record our learning experience. We feel that the experiences will contribute greatly to our education and that we will be contributing much needed labor and commitment to the women's health movement. (Editor's Note: This paper instead turned out to be a very skillful analysis of political factionalizing within the Elizabeth Blackwell Center, in response to immediate circumstances.)

Joanne Van Kirk, "Women's Music"

My project will consist of an analyzation of the contents of music sung by women in the Twin Cities. Some questions to be considered are: what percentage of the songs in her repertoire are written by women? Men?; What is the music saying?; Do the songs have a recurring theme?; What is she communicating through her original songs?; Outside of herself, on what does she comment in her originals? Based on the results of this analysis, I hope to show the significance the musical content has as a statement on women's culture in the Twin Cities.

APPENDIX D

STUDENT PROFILES

Subject Number (1-5) ____________
leave blank

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Sex (7): _____(1) Male Age (9-10): _____ University ID No. ____________
_____(2) Female

Name (13-36): ____________ / ____________ / ____________
Last First Middle

Local Phone No. (37-43): ____________ Permanent Phone No. ____________

Local Address ________________________________

____
Zip Code

Permanent Address ________________________________

____
Zip Code

Instructor's Name (44-54): ____________ / ____________ / ________
Last First Initial

Course: (55-58) ____________ (59-62) ________ (63-65 ________
Dept. abbreviation Number Section

Term: (66) ____________ (67-68) ____________
Quarter Year

I am taking this course in: (Check one) (69)

_____ 1. Day School _____ 3. Other. Please explain. ________

_____ 2. Extension Division ________________

Status in This Course: (Check one) (70)

_____ 1. I am enrolled for full credit
_____ 2. I am enrolled for no credit (reduced tuition)
_____ 3. I am auditing the course
_____ 4. I am just "sitting in" on the course
_____ 5. Other. (Please explain) ________________________

Subject Number (1-5) __________
leave blank

BACKGROUND INFORMATION -- continued

Time spent as a Student: (Check one) (71)

_____ 1. I am a full-time student working on a degree
_____ 2. I am a part-time student working on a degree
_____ 3. I occasionally take courses, but I am not working on a degree
_____ 4. Other. (Please explain) ______________________________

____

Day School and/or Extension Student? (Check one) (72)

_____ 1. I am primarily a day school student
_____ 2. I am primarily an extension division student
_____ 3. I divide my time equally between being a day school student and an extension division student
_____ 4. Other. (Please explain) ______________________________

____

Student Status (Check one) (73)

_____ 1. Freshman
_____ 2. Sophomore
_____ 3. Junior
_____ 4. Senior
_____ 5. Graduate
_____ 6. Adult Special
_____ 7. Other. Please Explain:
____

What is your major? ______________________________

What is the highest level of education you hope to attain? (Check one) (74)

_____ 1. Two year degree (e.g., AA, ALA, etc.)
_____ 2. Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS, etc.)
_____ 3. Master's degree (e.g., MA, MS, etc.)
_____ 4. Ph.D., E.Ed
_____ 5. Professional Degree (e.g., M.D., LL.B., etc.) Please indicate: __________

____

_____ 6. Other: Please indicate: ______________________________

What is your overall cumulative Grade-point Average at the University of Minnesota? (75)

_____ 1. 2.0 or below
_____ 2. 2.1-2.5
_____ 3. 2.6-3.0
_____ 4. 3.1-3.5
_____ 5. 3.6-4.0
_____ 6. Other. Please explain:
____

Subject Number (1-5) ____________
leave blank

BACKGROUND INFORMATION -- continued

Marital Status (Check one) (76)

____ 1. Married
____ 2. Single (never married)
____ 3. Divorced
____ 4. Separated
____ 5. Widowed
____ 6. Other. Please indicate: ____________

Number of Courses about Women (excluding Women's Studies courses) taken (Check one) (77)

____ 1. None
____ 2. 1-2
____ 3. 3-4
____ 4. 5-6
____ 5. 7-8
____ 6. 9-10
____ 7. 11+

Please indicate which courses: ____________

Number of WOMEN'S STUDIES Courses taken (Check one) (78)

____ 1. None
____ 2. 1-2
____ 3. 3-4
____ 4. 5-6
____ 5. 7-8
____ 6. 9-10
____ 7. 11+

Please indicate which courses: ____________

EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT with the Women's Movement (Check one) (79)

____ 1. None
____ 2. Very Little
____ 3. Little
____ 4. A Fair Amount
____ 5. Much
____ 6. Very Much
____ 7. An Exceptional Amount

Please describe the kind of involvement with the Women's Movement (e.g., organizations, books read, etc.) ____________

Subject Number (1-5)______________
leave blank

BACKGROUND INFORMATION -- continued

Are you currently employed? (Check one) (80)

_____ 1. Yes, full-time
_____ 2. Yes, part-time
_____ 3. No
_____ 4. Other. Please explain
____
____

Describe your job/occupation? (e.g., position, title, what you do, etc.) _______
____
____
____

THANK YOU!

Table 1

Background Information About Students

in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Fall 1976-Winter 1977

Item	N = 16	
	f	%[a]
Age ($\bar{x}$ = 24.4 years)		
21	3	18.8
22	3	18.8
23	1	6.2
24	2	12.5
25	2	12.5
26	1	6.2
27	2	12.5
28	1	6.2
33	1	6.2
Marital Status		
Married	2	12.5
Never Married	9	56.2
Divorced	3	18.8
Widowed	--	--
Other	2	12.5
Time As Student		
Full time, working on degree	11	68.8
Part time, working on degree	5	31.2
Day or Extension Student		
Primarily day student	14	87.5
Half day, half extension	2	12.5
Student Status		
Junior	4	25.0
Senior	11	68.8
Adult Special	1	6.2
Major		
WoSt	12	75.0
Interdisciplinary[a]	3	18.8
No response	1	6.2

Table 1 -- continued

	N = 16	
Item	f	%
Highest Degree Sought		
Bachelor's degree	2	12.5
Master's degree	9	56.2
Doctorate degree	2	12.5
Professional degree	2	12.5
Don't know	1	6.2
Current Employment		
Full time	4	25.0
Part time	10	67.5
Not employed	2	12.5

[a] All WoSt: 1 with Law, 1 with French, 1 with history and anthropology.

Table 2

Previous Experiences in Women's Movement and Women's Courses of Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Fall 1976-Winter 1977

Previous Experience	N = 16	
	f	%[a]
Course About Women[a]		
None	5	31.2
1-2	7	43.8
3-4	4	25.0
Women's Studies Courses[b]		
None	--	--
1-2	3	18.8
3-4	6	37.5
5-6	6	37.5
7-8	1	6.2
Extent of Involvement in Women's Movement		
None	--	--
Very little	4	25.0
Little	1	6.2
Fair amount	4	25.0
Much	2	12.5
Very much	3	18.8
Exceptional amount	2	12.5
Kind of Involvement in Women's Movement[c]		
Reading feminist literature	12	75.0
Involvement in women's groups	9	56.2
Political activity	5	31.2
Work for feminist organization	2	12.5
Writing, research on women	2	12.5
Self-contact and awareness	1	6.2

---

[a] Excluding WoSt courses.

[b] Excluding courses about women.

[c] Categories not independent; percentages may total more than 100.

Table 3

Vocational and Educational Plans of Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Fall 1976-Winter 1977

Plans	N = 11 f	%[a]
EDUCATIONAL		
Graduate School	4	36.4
Uncertain, probably M.A.	1	9.1
Law School	1	9.1
Not sure	5	45.5
VOCATIONAL		
Work with women (teaching, counseling, organizing)	1	9.1
Women's Studies and Women	1	9.1
Women and Criminal Justice	1	9.1
Women and Literature	1	9.1
Law, Public Health, or Women's History	1	9.1
Have Ph.D. to teach and MBA to make money and support feminist enterprises	1	9.1

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total more than 100.

APPENDIX E

STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS

COURSE EVALUATION

WoSt 3-900
Senior Seminar
Winter 1977

This evaluation pertains to the second quarter (Winter) of the Senior Seminar. As you know, many questions are asked as a course is developed over time. The questions asked here, e.g., the impact of the course on the student (her thinking, feelings, plans, and goals), the course structure, content, and instructors, are some of the most important to ask. So please answer these questions as thoughtfully and as candidly as possible.

We truly appreciate your help. Thank you very much!

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree	Most Strongly Agree
In General:							
1. procedures for determing grades were appropriate for this course.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. the amount of work required was appropriate for the number of credits required.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. adequate information about how well I was doing was readily available.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. adequate help was available when I needed it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. my responsibilities in the course were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I felt I had adequate background for this course.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I would recommend this course to a friend.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. How much did you like the SUBJECT MATTER of this course (Winter quarter), forgetting about the instructors?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disliked Intensely	Disliked Greatly	Disliked Somewhat	Liked Somewhat	Liked A Lot	Liked Very Much	Liked Exceptionally Well

9. How much did you like a given instructor AS A PERSON?

	Disliked Intensely	Disliked Considerably	Disliked Somewhat	Liked Somewhat	Liked A Lot	Liked Very Much	Liked Exceptionally Well
C. Register	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Dewald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Jones	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P. Faunce	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. How would you rate a given instructor's OVERALL TEACHING ABILITY?

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Exceptionally Good
C. Register	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Dewald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Jones	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P. Faunce	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. How much would you say you have LEARNED from a given instructor?

	Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
C. Register	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Dewald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Jones	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P. Faunce	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. How much would you say you LEARNED from the course, forgetting about the instructors?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

13. How much EFFORT did you put into this course?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

14. Under which GRADING OPTION are you taking this course?

1	2	3
A-N	S--N	Other

15. What is your overall cumulative GRADE POINT AVERAGE at the University of Minnesota?

1	2	3	4	5	6
2.0 or Below	2.1-2.5	2.6-3.0	3.1-3.5	3.6-4.0	Other

16. Which Women's Studies Major plan are you following? (Check one)

______ a. Sequence A (Concentration in WoSt courses plus in 1 or 2 other fields of study)

______ b. Sequence B (Concentration in WoSt.)

______ c. Other. Please explain ______________________________

____

____

____

17. What are your Vocational and Educational Plans/Situation?

18. How does this course (Winter quarter) relate to other courses you have taken? How has it affected the way you approach other courses?

    a. How does this course relate to other courses you have taken?

    b. How has this course affected your approach in other courses?

19. How have you felt similar to and/or different from the other students in the course during Winter quarter?

20. How much and in what ways do you feel this course (Winter quarter) has contributed to your education? How has it affected your educational and vocational plans?

    a. Contributed to your education

    b. Affected your educational/vocational plans

21. Please comment on the READINGS assigned by a given instructor for a specific topic. Include in your commentary points regarding the following -- (1) level of difficulty, (2) suitability to the course objectives, (3) relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis, (4) usefulness to your own interests and objectives.

a. Philosophy of Science readings (B. Dewald)

b. Anthropology readings (J. Jones)

c. Literary Criticism readings (C. Register)

21. -- continued

d. C. G. Jung readings (J. Jones)

e. Marxism readings (C. Register)

f. Biases in Behavioral and Social Sciences readings (P. Faunce)

22. Please comment on the WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS designated by a given instructor for a specific topic. Include in your comments points regarding the following -- (1) level of difficulty, (2) suitability to the course objectives, (3) relationship to an interdisciplinary emphasis, (4) usefulness to your own interests and objectives.

    a. Anthropology: Feminist Methodology and Assumptions in Anthropology (select from a given list) (Jones)

    b. Literary Criticism: Feminist Literary Criticism (Register)

c. Jung: Choose one Jungian concept and indicate how it supports or contradicts a Feminist perspective (Jones)

d. Marxism: Two options: (1) Marxist Approach to one's own project, or (2) Survey of method used in a Marxist-feminist article (Register)

e. Biases in Behavioral and Social Sciences. Trends, Themes, Highlights in The Readings (Faunce)

23. Please comment on the following characteristics of EACH INSTRUCTOR as they enhanced or detracted from the course.

   a. Grasp of the Material

      C. Register

      B. Dewald

      J. Jones

      P. Faunce

b. Communication Skills/Clarity of Presentation

C. Register

B. Dewald

J. Jones

P. Faunce

c. Attitudes toward Students

C. Register

B. Dewald

J. Jones

P. Faunce

24. Please comment on the Winter quarter TEAM OF INSTRUCTORS itself, e.g., the effectiveness of the team, the working relations, cohesiveness, coordination, etc.

25. How do you feel about a team approach in a course such as this, e.g., should a team approach be used, how should such a team operate if used, what are alternatives to a team approach in this course, etc.

26. What seemed to be the GOALS/OBJECTIVES of the instructors for the course Winter quarter? In what ways were these goals met and not met?

27. As you see it at this point, what do you believe the goals/objectives of a Women's Studies Senior Seminar ought to be? What part do you think the Senior Seminar should play in the Women's Studies Program?

28. What things about this course during the Winter quarter particularly HEIGHTENED OR DIMINISHED YOUR MOTIVATION to really "get into" the subject matter?

    a. Heightened Motivation to get into the subject matter

    b. Diminished Motivation to get into the subject matter

29. What were the MOST SATISFYING things about this course during the Winter quarter? The MOST DISAPPOINTING?

    a. Most Satisfying

    b. Most Disappointing

30. How would you rate yourself as assuming RESPONSIBILITY for your OWN learning in this course Winter quarter?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

31. How would you rate yourself as assuming RESPONSIBILITY for the learning of OTHERS in this course Winter quarter?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

32. In what ways did you contribute to the course? How do you feel about your contributions?

a. Your contributions

b. How do you feel about them?

33. What are your expectations for the course Spring quarter, e.g., what do you and do you not look forward to, what would you like to see happen or not happen, etc.

34. Please make any further evaluative comments or suggestions for improvement here.

Thank you again.

Table 4

Comments Regarding the Assigned Readings by Students

in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Readings	N = 11 f	%
A. PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY OF SCIENCE		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	11	100.0
Not difficult	--	--
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	2	18.2
Not suitable	3	27.3
Don't know	4	36.4
No comment	2	18.2
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	6	54.6
No relationship	3	27.3
No comment	2	18.2
4. Useful to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	3	27.3
Not useful	5	45.5
No comment	3	27.3
B. ANTHROPOLOGY		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	1	9.1
Not difficult	10	90.9
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	7	63.6
Not suitable	2	18.2
No comment	2	18.2
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	4	36.4
No relationship	4	36.4
No comment	3	27.3

Table continued

Table 4 -- continued

Readings	N = 11 f	%
B. ANTHROPOLOGY -- cont.		
4. Useful to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	4	36.4
Not useful	5	45.5
No comment	2	18.2
C. LITERARY CRITICISM		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	1	9.1
Not difficult	10	90.9
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	6	54.6
Not suitable	1	9.1
Don't know	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	7	63.6
No relationship	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3
4. Usefulness to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	7	63.6
Not useful	3	27.3
No comment	1	9.1
D. C.G. JUNG		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	2	18.2
Not difficult	5	45.5
Some difficult, some not	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3

Table continued

Table 4 -- continued

	N = 11	
Readings	f	%
D. C.G. JUNG -- cont.		
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	4	36.4
Not suitable	5	45.5
No comment	2	18.2
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	4	36.4
No relationship	4	36.4
No comment	3	27.3
4. Usefulness to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	6	54.6
Not useful	1	9.1
No comment	4	36.4
E. MARXISM		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	7	63.6
Not difficult	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	6	54.6
Not Suitable	2	18.2
No comment	3	27.3
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	6	54.6
No relationship	1	9.1
No comment	4	36.4
4. Usefulness to Own Intersts and Objectives		
Useful	8	72.7
Not useful	1	9.1
No comment	2	18.2

Table continued

Table 4 -- continued

Readings	N = 11 f	%
F. BIASES IN BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	5	45.5
Not difficult	4	36.4
Some difficult, some not	3	27.3
No comment	2	18.2
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	10	90.9
Not suitable	--	--
No comment	1	9.1
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	9	81.8
No relationship	--	--
No comment	2	18.2
4. Usefulness to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	8	72.7
Not useful	--	--
No comment	3	27.3

Table 5

Comments Regarding the Written Assignments
by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

	N = 11	
Written Assignment	f	%
A. FEMINIST METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS IN ANTHROPOLOGY		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	5	45.5
Not difficult	3	27.3
No comment	2	18.2
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	4	36.4
Not suitable	2	18.2
No comment	5	45.5
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	3	27.3
No relationship	1	9.1
No comment	7	63.7
4. Usefulness to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	3	27.3
Not useful	2	18.2
No comment	6	54.6
B. FEMINIST LITERARY CRITICISM		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	2	18.2
Not difficult	6	54.6
Don't know	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	6	54.6
Not suitable	1	9.1
Don't know	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	3	27.3
No relationship	--	--
No comment	8	72.7

Table continued

Table 5 — continued

	N = 11	
Written Assignment	f	%
B. FEMINIST LITERARY CRITICISM -- cont.		
4. Usefulness to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	7	63.7
Not useful	1	9.1
No comment	3	36.3
C. CHOOSE ONE JUNGIAN CONCEPT AND INDICATE HOW IT SUPPORTS OR CONTRADICTS A FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	6	54.6
Not difficult	3	27.3
No comment	2	18.2
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	5	45.5
Not suitable	1	9.1
No comment	5	45.5
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	4	36.4
No relationship	3	27.3
No comment	5	45.5
4. Usefulness to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	4	36.4
Not useful	3	27.3
No comment	4	36.4
D. (1) MARXIST APPROACH TO ONE'S OWN PROJECT, OR (2) SURVEY OF METHOD USED IN A MARXIST-FEMINIST ARTICLE		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	2	18.2
Not difficult	5	45.5
No comment	4	36.4
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	7	63.7
Not suitable	--	--
No comment	4	36.4

Table continued

Table 5 -- continued

	N = 11	
Written Assignment	f	%
D. (1) MARXIST APPROACH TO ONE'S OWN PROJECT, OR (2) SURVEY OF METHOD USED IN A MARXIST-FEMINIST ARTICLE -- continued		
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	5	45.5
No relationship	--	--
No comment	6	54.6
4. Usefulness to Own Interest and Objectives		
Useful	6	54.6
Not useful	2	18.2
No comment	3	27.3
E. TRENDS, THEMES, HIGHLIGHTS IN THE READINGS ON BIASES IN THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES		
1. Level of Difficulty		
Difficult	4	36.4
Not difficult	3	27.3
No comment	4	36.4
2. Suitability to Course Objectives		
Suitable	6	54.6
Not suitable	--	--
No comment	5	45.5
3. Relationship to Interdisciplinary Emphasis		
A relationship	4	36.4
No relationship	--	--
No comment	7	63.6
4. Usefulness to Own Interests and Objectives		
Useful	5	45.5
Not useful	1	9.1
No comment	4	36.4

Table 6

Evaluation of Instructors by Students

in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Instructor Characteristics as they Enhanced or Detracted from the Seminar	N = 11	
	f	%
A. GRASP OF THE MATERIAL		
1. *C. REGISTER*		
Marx		
Enhanced (valuable, well-versed, a lot to offer, good)	7	63.6
Detracted (admittedly limited, little grasp but adequate, qualified, should have more knowledge)	4	36.4
Literary Criticism		
Enhanced (excellent, great background, asked interesting questions, good understanding, well versed, a lot to offer, knows own field)	11	100.0
Detracted	--	--
2. *B. DEWALD*		
Enhanced (knows her field and has articulated her own theories, really liked her understanding of the material, generally thorough, able to provide detail, well-versed, a lot to offer, second presentation skillfully outlined)	6	54.5

Table continued

Table 6 --continued

Instructor Characteristics as they Enhanced or Detracted from the Seminar	N = 11 f	 %
A. 2. *B. DEWALD* -- continued		
Detracted (extremely knowledgeable but conveyed it on a level too difficult for us, talked 'above' class, needs to address class with clearer material, too good a grasp -- went way over my head)	3	27.3
No Comment (Everyone a little hard on Barb considering it was her first quarter teaching)	2	18.2
3. *J. JONES*		
Anthropology		
Enhanced (vast background, exploring, personal, well-versed, a lot to offer, great ability to clearly explain, good, broadness exceptional, knows field)	9	81.9
Detracted (biased understanding of her material)	2	18.2
Jung		
Enhanced (vast background, exploring, personal, well-versed, a lot to offer, great ability to clearly explain, good, broadness exceptional)	7	63.7
Detracted (too personalized of a presentation, biased understanding of her material)	4	36.4

Table continued

Table 6 -- continued

Instructor Characteristics as the Enhanced or Detracted from the Seminar	N = 11	
	f	%
4. *P. FAUNCE*		
Enhanced (excellent, good, obviously good, explained things well, good understanding, good background provided, related personal thoughts, well-versed, a lot to offer, clear, straight forward, knows field well)	11	100.0
Detracted	--	--
B. COMMUNICATION SKILLS/CLARITY OF PRESENTATION		
1. *C. REGISTER*		
Enhanced (very good, diagrams added interest, clear, well-organized, articulate, good teacher skills, thorough, questioning, easy to understand, speaks slowly, exceptional)	10	90.9
Detracted (elitist, confusing but left room for good discussion)	1	9.1
2. *B. DEWALD*		
Enhanced (got a lot of notes from her fast style of presenting, pointed out her own limitations accurately and openly which I appreciated, average, exceptional, average to good skills, average to good clarity)	5	45.5
Detracted (too technical, conveyed on a level too difficult for us, needs more practice, needs to organize material better and to speak more in lay language, not too great but showed considerable adapability to needs of students, sometimes too complex -- hazy --professional, speaks well but overlooked the fact that we haven't much of a background in her area)	6	54.5

Table 6 -- continued

Instructor Characteristics as they Enhanced or Detracted From the Seminar	N = 11 f	 %
B. COMMUNICATION SKILLS/CLARITY OF PRESENTATION -- continued		
3. *J. JONES*		
Enhanced (very good at inserting appropriate examples for clarification, good communication skills in lecturing, clear lectures, good style, enthusiastic, excellent speaker, well-organized, probing, always quite clear, excellent, exceptional, average to good skills, average to good clarity)	10	90.9
Detracted (probably not bad but above my head and biased)	1	9.1
4. *P. FAUNCE*	11	100.0
Enhanced (explained things well, good examples, good skills, clear, liked student participation, real good, she knows how to be political and subtle at the same time, leads discussion well, thorough in explanations, excellent, sought responses, personalized theories, well-organized, very good, speaks well, shows interest and personal involvement in area, exceptional, average to good skills, average to good clarity)		
Detracted	--	--

Table continued

Table 6 -- continued

Instructor Characteristics as they Enhanced or Detracted From the Seminar	N = 11 f	%
C. ATTITUDES TOWARD STUDENTS		
1. *C. REGISTER*		
Enhanced (respectful of students, understanding of their problems with material, good, open, really concerned and caring for us, critical in a good way, very receptive, personal, sought responses and interpretations, excellent, very helpful, great attitude, friendly, not afraid to question herself, seemed to take our intelligence for granted -- as an accepted fact, treated us with more respect than has ever been my experience)	8	72.7
Detracted (appears to be approachable but only to a certain extent -- fairly elitist)	1	9.1
Enhanced and Detracted (afraid of students and criticism, friendly and open)	1	9.1
No Comment	1	9.1
2. *B. DEWALD*		
Enhanced (open, on our level, accepts criticism well and actually makes use of it! does not just pay lip service to students, receptive to questions, I liked Barb, seemed eager to help, treated us with more respect than has ever been my experience, good attitude toward criticism)	6	54.5

Table continued

Table 6 -- continued

Instruction Characteristics as they Enhanced or Detracted From the Seminar	N = 11	
	f	%
C. 2. *B. DEWALD* -- continued		
Detracted (condesending, made us feel inadequate, seemed apprehensive)	2	18.2
Enhanced and Detracted (concerned yet somewhat removed)	1	9.1
No Comment	2	18.2
3. *J. JONES*		
Enhanced (seemed encouraging, very receptive, excellent, cooperative, treated us with more respect than has ever been my experience, good attitude)	5	45.5
Detracted (defensive)	1	9.1
Enhanced and Detracted (a. Seemed too maternal at times, more than equalitarian at times, generally good, but sometimes difficult to disagree with; b. Seemed to expect too much, couldn't always relate to others who had no experience with her interests, open to questions and problems; c. Seemed friedly, but a bet strained, she's introspective but at times that seemed judgmental, warm and open when into an area she's comfortable with)	3	27.3
No Comment	2	18.2

Table continued

Table 6 -- continued

Instructor Characteristics as they Enhanced or Detracted From the Seminar	N = 11	
	f	%
C. ATTITUDES TOWARD STUDENTS -- continued		
4. *P. FAUNCE*		
Enhanced (interested in students, respected their opinions, open, seemed to give us lots of credibility which is more than most professionals, very receptive, approachable, pleasant, sought personal responses and attitudes, respectful, excellent, willing to help, great, very friendly, very open, very supportive, very honest, a good role model, treated us with more respect than has ever been my experience, good attitude)	10	90.9
Detracted	--	--
No Comment	1	9.1

Table 8

Comments of Students Regarding the Team Approach and the Team of Instructors in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

	N = 11	
Item	f	%
A. Please comment on the TEAM OF INSTRUCTORS, e.g., the effectiveness of the team, the working relations, cohesiveness, coordination, etc.		
Positive (cooperative, supportive, willing, competent, flexible, organized, coodinated, reinforced each other, learned from each other, enjoyed each other, integrated knowledge, effective, prepared, non-competitive, non-hierarchial)	5	45.4
Negative (sometimes seemed competitive, little cohesiveness, fairly ineffective, not very good working relations)	5	45.4
No Comment	1	9.1
B. How do you feel about a TEAM APPROACH in a course such as this, i.e., should a team approach be used?		
Yes	6	54.5
No	2	18.2
Don't Know	1	9.1
No Comment	2	18.2

Table 7

Responses Regarding Each Instructor as a Person, Overall Teaching Ability,
and How Much Learned by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Item	N	$\bar{x}$	SD														
How much did you like a given instructor as a PERSON?				1 Disliked Intensely		2 Disliked Considerably		3 Disliked Somewhat		4 Liked Somewhat		5 Liked A Lot		6 Liked Very Much		7 Liked Exceptionally Well	
				f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
C. Register	10	6.2	1.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	20	--	--	2	20	6	60
B. Dewald	10	5.3	1.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	30	2	20	4	40	1	10
J. Jones	10	5.1	1.67	--	--	1	10	--	--	3	30	2	20	1	10	3	30
P. Faunce	10	6.1	1.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	10	2	20	2	20	5	50
How would you rate a given instructor's OVERALL TEACHING ABILITY?				1 Very Poor		2 Poor		3 Fair		4 Good		5 Very Good		6 Excellent		7 Exceptionally Good	
				f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
C. Register	11	5.7	1.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	27.3	--	--	5	45.5	3	27.3
B. Dewald	11	4.0	1.1	--	--	1	9.1	2	18.2	4	45.5	2	18.2	1	9.1	--	--
J. Jones	11	4.9	1.6	--	--	1	9.1	1	9.1	2	18.2	2	18.2	6	36.4	1	9.1
P. Faunce	9	5.7	1.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	22.2	1	11.1	5	55.6	1	11.1
How much would you say you have LEARNED from a given instructor?				1 Almost Nothing		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
				f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
C. Register	11	5.2	1.5	--	--	1	9.1	--	--	3	27.3	--	--	6	54.6	1	9.1
B. Dewald	11	4.0	1.2	--	--	1	9.1	3	27.3	3	27.3	3	27.3	1	9.1	--	--
J. Jones	11	4.7	1.6	--	--	2	18.2	--	--	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3	1	9.1
P. Faunce	11	6.3	1.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	18.2	5	45.5	2	18.2	2	18.2

Table 9

Responses Regarding Certain Aspects of the Seminar by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Item	N = 11 $\bar{x}$	SD	1 Very Strongly Disagree		2 Strongly Disagree		3 Disagree		4 Agree		5 Strongly Agree		6 Very Strongly Agree		7 Most Strongly Agree	
In General . . .			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
procedures for determining grades were appropriate for this course.	4.36	.95	--	--	1	9.1	1	9.1	4	36.4	3	27.3	2	18.2	--	--
the amount of work required was appropriate for the number of credits required.	5.18	1.59	--	--	--	--	4	36.4	3	27.3	1	9.1	3	27.3	--	--
adequate information about how well I was doing was readily available.	3.73	1.42	1	9.1	--	--	4	36.4	4	36.4	--	--	2	18.2	--	--
adequate help was available when I needed it.	4.64	1.57	--	--	1	9.1	1	9.1	4	36.4	2	18.2	1	9.1	2	18.2
my responsibilities in the course were clearly defined	2.91	2.02	1	9.1	3	27.3	2	18.2	2	18.2	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	9.1
I felt I had adequate background for this course.	3.09	1.54	1	9.1	4	36.4	2	18.2	2	18.2	1	9.1	1	9.1	--	--
I would recommend this course to a friend.	3.41	1.63	1	9.1	3	27.3	1.5	13.6	3.5	31.8	--	--	2	18.2	--	--
			1 Disliked Intensely		2 Disliked Greatly		3 Disliked Somewhat		4 Liked Somewhat		5 Liked A Lot		6 Liked Very Much		7 Liked Exceptionally Well	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How much did you like the SUBJECT MATTER of this course, forgetting about the instructors?	5.73	1.70	--	--	--	--	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3	1	9.1	2	18.2
			1 Almost Nothing		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How much would you say you LEARNED from the course, forgetting about the instructors?	4.73	1.42	--	--	1	9.1	1	9.1	2	18.2	4	36.4	2	18.2	1	9.1
How much EFFORT did you put into this course?	5.27	1.35	--	--	--	--	2	18.2	--	--	4	36.4	3	27.3	2	18.2

Table 10

Comments of Students Regarding Factors Which Heightened and Diminished Their Motivation to Get Into the Subject Matter in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Item	N = 11 f	 %[a]
A. HEIGHTENED MOTIVATION		
Interesting subjects	4	36.4
Quality of instructors	1	9.1
Instructors' attitudes	1	9.1
Interdisciplinary nature of course	1	9.1
The discussions	1	9.1
Psychology readings	1	9.1
My project	1	9.1
Realizing how much I have to learn	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3
B. DIMINISHED MOTIVATION		
Too many readings	4	36.4
Lack of clear expectations and goals	2	18.2
Irrelevance of materials	2	18.2
Shortness of time spent on each topic	2	182.
Lack of integration of areas	2	18.2
Instructors' attitudes	1	9.1
Literary criticism	1	9.1
Having my ideas negated as my "opinions"	1	9.1
Instructor's criticism of assignments	1	9.1
Anti-academic attitudes of students	1	9.1
Winter blahs	1	9.1

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 11

Comments of Students Regarding Factors Which Were Most Satisfying and Disappointing About the WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Item	N = 11 f	%[a]
A. MOST SATISFYING things about the seminar		
Academically substantive material	3	27.3
Interdisciplinary nature of course	2	18.2
Readings	2	18.2
Honest, non-judgmental, non-hierarchical structure and atmosphere	2	18.2
My feelings of accomplishment with work	2	18.2
The discussions	1	9.1
My project	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3
B. MOST DISAPPOINTING things about the seminar		
I was not disappointed!	1	9.1
Too much to learn so nothing absorbed	2	18.2
No depth in any one topic	2	18.2
Too little time on any one topic	1	9.1
Lack of sense of group	1	9.1
My lack of knowledge of areas	1	9.1
Everything especially instructors' attitudes and biases	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may toatl greater than 100.

Table 12

Comments Regarding How Students Felt Similar to and/or Different from Each Other in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

How have you felt SIMILAR TO AND/OR DIFFERENT FROM other students in the course Winter quarter?	N = 11 f	%[a]
SIMILARITIES		
Unity among students	2	18.2
Much frustration with course	2	18.2
Much questioning of design of this quarter	2	18.2
Little energy or sense of cohesiveness in course	1	9.1
All concerned and bright women	1	9.1
All WoSt majors and feminists	1	9.1
No dominating personalities	1	9.1
DIFFERENCES		
I had less of background than most	3	27.3
I felt incompetent and ignorant	1	9.1
I'm more academically oriented	1	9.1
I'm more interested in women and law	1	9.1
I'm a worker (not a student)	1	9.1
Many individual differences	1	9.1

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 13

Students' Assessments of Responsibility for Learning in and Contribution to the WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

	N = 11		1 Almost None		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount		No Comment	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How would you rate yourself as assuming RESPONSIBILITY for your OWN learning in this course Winter quarter?	4.8	.9	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	18.2	3	27.3	5	45.4	--	--	1	9.1
How would you rate yourself as assuming RESPONSIBILITY for the learning of others in this course Winter quarter?	3.4	1.1	--	--	1	9.1	2	18.2	6	54.5	--	--	1	9.1	--	--	1	9.1

		N=11			N=11	
		f	%[a]		f	%[a]
In what WAYS did YOU CONTRIBUTE to the course?	I raised questions	2	18.2	I attended class	1	9.1
	I discussed material in and out of class	2	18.2	I tried (so did others) to have input but to no avail	1	9.1
	I contributed when I understood material	1	9.1	I contributed little	1	9.1
	I worked hard on papers	1	9.1	I don't know	1	9.1
	I did all the readings	1	9.1	No comment	2	18.2
How do you FEEL about YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS?	My contributions were noteworthy but not earthshaking	1	9.1	I'm here to learn	1	9.1
	I hope to contribute more next quarter when the focus is more practical	1	9.1	I was often baffled and overwhelmed	2	18.2
				I feel bad	1	9.1
	They weren't worth much	2	18.2	No comment	4	36.4

---

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 14

Comments of Students Regarding Relationship of WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar" to Other Courses and How Seminar Affected Approach in Other Courses (Winter 1977)

Item	N = 11 f	 %[a]
A. RELATIONSHIP OF SEMINAR TO OTHER COURSES		
Content similar to some previous courses	4	36.4
Made me more able to examine critically their contents and integrate them	2	18.2
Feminist perspective to old material	2	18.2
Unlike anything else	2	18.2
Added clarity to traditonal, foggy areas	1	9.1
No comment	1	9.1
B. HOW SEMINAR AFFECTED APPROACH IN OTHER COURSES		
Had a balancing effect when looking at women's experience	2	18.2
Will use more non-traditional sources	2	18.2
Will be more interdisciplinary in approach to other courses	1	9.1
Will be more skeptical	1	9.1
Will be more able to analyze readings	1	9.1
Will look for sexism and other biases	1	9.1
Will understand other disciplines better	1	9.1
Remains to be seen -- not taking any more courses	1	9.1
No comment	3	27.3

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 15

Comments Regarding How Seminar Contributed to Education and Educational-Vocational Plans of Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Item	N = 11 f	 %[a]
A. How much and in what ways do you feel this course (Winter quarter) has CONTRIBUTED to your education?		
Introduced me to interesting, important new areas	4	36.4
Gave me more of intellectual, feminist perspective	3	27.3
Gave me insight about approaches to take in other areas	1	9.1
More depth	1	9.1
Introduced me to feminist readings	1	9.1
My last course -- onto other things	1	9.1
Not much (I said it was too confusing and unintegrated)	2	18.2
B. How has it AFFECTED your EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL PLANS?		
Made me want to go into academia	2	18.2
Made me want to have professional career	1	9.1
Increased my confidence in questioning biases	1	9.1
Hasn't really	7	63.6
Don't know	1	9.1

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 16

Seminar Goals of the Students (N = 10) and Whether or Not These Goals Were Met for WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar", Winter 1977

Goals[a]	Met[c]	Partially Met[c]	Not Met[c]
A. ACADEMIC (14)[b]			
1. Define/develop a "feminist" perspective in methodology. (3)[c]	1	2	
2. Help me introduce feminism in a positive manner to academia. (2)[c]	2		
3. Learn about research on women and its effects on women (and women's studies). Learn what feminists are creating... (2)[c]	1	1	
4. Help me devise research in my areas of interest. (3)[c]	2	1	
5. Develop a research project which I actually do as opposed to a paper. (2)[c]	2		
6. To feel a basic gut excitement about learning to do my own research. (1)[c]			1
7. Learn about good research techniques, resources, facilities. (2)[c]	1	1	
8. Determine importance of methodology per se. (1)[c]	1		
9. To understand fully what is meant by a "methodology". (1)[c]	1		
10. Learn about methodologies of other disciplines (academia) and how they came about. (3)[c]	2	1	

Table continued

Table 16 -- continued

Goals[a]	Met[c]	Partially Met[c]	Not Met[c]
A. ACADEMIC (14)[b]			
11. Learn to criticize research findings and literature. (3)[c]	3		
12. To have alot of input in the course -- an essential aspect in feminist teaching. (1)[c]			1
13. Understand subject matter on a non-abstract level. (1)[c]		1	
14. Learn what WoSt Program expects of its majors. (1)[c]	1		
B. PERSONAL (6)[b]			
1. Help me find direction in my education and/or life. (3)[c]	2		1
2. Experience and learn more about feminism and a (my) feminist perspective. (3)[c]	2	1	
3. Broaden my base of knowledge about myself as a woman or "female person". (1)[c]	1		
4. Maintain contact with bright women (i.e. maintain sanity). (1)[c]		1	
5. Come to a compromise between my idealistic expectations and the realities so that my efforts will have relevance. (1)[c]		1	

Table continued

Table 16 -- continued

Goals[a] B. PERSONAL (6)[b]	Met[c]	Partially Met[c]	Not Met[c]
6. Lose my fear of research. (1)[c]		1	
C. OVERALL SUMMARY (20)[b]	21	11	3

[a] Total of 20 goals stated by ten students

[b] This number represents goals, not students. Most students listed more than one goal.

[c] These figures represent the number of students who listed a given goal.

Table 17

Student Perceptions of Instructors' Goals/Objectives

for the WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Goals/Objectives	N = 11	
	f	%[a]
Teach us the methodologies of various disciplines	7	63.6
Define and think about "feminist" perspective	4	36.4
Teach us research skills	1	9.1
Prepare us to do our spring project	1	9.1
Supply us with information	1	9.1
I don't know	1	9.1

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 18

Comments Regarding What the Goals/Objectives of a Women's Studies Senior Seminar Ought to be by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Winter 1977

Item	N = 11 f	 %[a]
As you see it at this point, what do you believe the GOALS/OBJECTIVES of a Women's Studies Senior Seminar ought to be?		
It should define "feminist" methodology	4	36.4
It should deal with more job-related issues	2	18.2
It should help students to feel close to one another and participate together	2	18.2
Have student input	1	9.1
It should focus more on areas of student concentration	1	9.1
It should continue to be cross-disciplinary and integrate areas	1	9.1
There should be more WoSt prerequisites	1	9.1
It is a valuable and important part of the program, especially for majors	2	18.2
No comment	1	9.1

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 19

Expectations for the Spring 1977 Seminar by Student in the Winter 1977 WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar"

Item	N = 11	
	f	%[a]
What are YOUR EXPECTATIONS for the course Spring quarter, e.g., what do you and do you not look forward to, what would you like to see happen or not happen, etc?		
I hope for more communication and cohesiveness among the students	5	45.5
I'm looking forward to the projects	4	36.4
I'd like help with job search	1	9.1
I'd like us to talk about practical applications of the material	1	9.1
I'm looking forward to self-directed work	1	9.1
I want to learn a lot	1	9.1
I want to be fairly and objectively evaluated	1	9.1
I won't be there	1	9.1
No comment	2	18.2

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

COURSE EVALUATION

WoSt 3-900
Senior Seminar
Spring 1977

This evaluation pertains to the third quarter (Spring) of the Senior Seminar. As you know, many questions are asked as a course is developed over time. The questions asked here, e.g., the impact of the course on the student (her thinking, feelings, plans, and goals), the course structure, content, and instructors, are some of the most important to ask. Your responses will be exceedingly helpful in planning next year's Senior Seminar.

This evaluation is also crucially important for the final report that must be written as a part of the obligation that Women's Studies has for the grant it received from the Educational Development Office to develop the Senior Seminar. So please answer these questions as thoughtfully and as candidly as possible, and return the form as soon as possible.

We truly appreciate your help. Thank you very much!

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree	Most Strongly Agree
In General:							
1. procedures for determining grades were appropriate for this course.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. the amount of work required was appropriate for the number of credits required.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. adequate information about how well I was doing was readily available.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. my responsibilities in the course were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I felt I had adequate background for this course.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I would recommend this course to a friend.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. How much did you like the FORMAT of the course (Spring quarter), forgetting about the instructors?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disliked Intensely	Disliked Greatly	Disliked Somewhat	Liked Somewhat	Liked A Lot	Liked Very Much	Liked Exceptionally Well

8. How much would you say you LEARNED from the course (Spring quarter), forgetting about the instructors?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

9. How much EFFORT overall did you put into this course (Spring quarter)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

10. How does this course (Spring quarter) relate to other courses you have taken? How has it affected the way you approach other courses?

a. How does this course relate to other courses you have taken?

b. How has this course affected your approach in other courses?

11. How have you felt similar to and/or different from the other students in the course during Spring quarter?

12. How much and in what ways do you feel this course (Spring quarter) has contributed to your education? How has it affected your educational and vocational plans?

   a. Contributed to your education

   b. Affected your educational/vocational plans

13. What seemed to be the GOALS/OBJECTIVES of doing a PROJECT for the course Spring quarter? In what ways were these goals met and not met?

14. Who was your PROJECT ADVISOR? ______________________________

15. How much HELP did you DESIRE from your project advisor?

Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. How often did YOU SEEK OUT your advisor for HELP with your PROJECT?

Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. How HELPFUL was your project advisor?

Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Exceptionally Good
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. How much EFFORT did you put into your PROJECT?

Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

19. How valuable to you was YOUR ORAL REPORT on your project?

Almost No Value	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20, a. How much did presenting an ORAL REPORT on your project teach you about yourself?

Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

b. Please elaborate:

21. How valuable to you was your WRITTEN PAPER on your project?

Almost No Value	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

22. a. What INSIGHTS did THE SECOND SEX (Simone De Beauvoir) provide for/into the ISSUES you dealt with in your PROJECT?

Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

b. Please elaborate:

23. a. How much did FACILITATING CLASS DISCUSSIONS on THE SECOND SEX teach you about yourself?

Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

b. Please elaborate:

24. How appropriate to the course was the book THE SECOND SEX?

Not Appropriate	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

25. Please describe what YOUR PROJECT overall offered of value to you (e.g., your feminist perspective, you political understanding? your career aspirations? your personal growth, etc.?).

26. In *GENERAL*, what did you learn from the OTHER STUDENTS' ORAL PROJECT REPORTS?

Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

27. In *SPECIFIC*, what did you learn from the ORAL PROJECT OF OTHER STUDENTS?

	Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
Shelly Anderson "Women's Emerging Spirituality"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ann Boerth "Prostitution"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Susan David "Child Birth"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mary Jo Dobson "Orlando (Virginia Woolf)"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sharleen Goldberg "Wedding Industry"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jan Karpel "T.C. Women's Collectives"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

27. Continued	Almost Nothing	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount
Kathy Knutson "Female Juvenile Delinquents . . ."	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kathleen MacKenzie "Eliza. Blackwell's Women's Hlth Ctr"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gail Plewacki "Eliza. Blackwell's Women's Hlth Ctr"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Joanne Van Kirk "Women's Music"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

28. What things about this course during Spring quarter particularly HEIGHTENED OR DIMINISHED YOUR MOTIVATION to really "get into" the subject matter?

a. Heightened Motivation to get into the subject matter

b. Diminished Motivation to get into the subject matter

29. What were the MOST SATISFYING things about this course during Spring quarter? The MOST DISAPPOINTING?

a. Most Satisfying

b. Most Disappointing

30. How would you rate yourself as assuming RESPONSIBILITY for your OWN learning in this course Spring quarter?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

31. How would you rate yourself as assuming RESPONSIBILITY for the learning of OTHERS in this course Spring quarter?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost None	Very Little	Little	A Fair Amount	Much	Very Much	An Exceptional Amount

32. In what ways did you contribute to the course Spring quarter? How do you feel about your contributions?

a. Your contributions

32. Continued

b. How do you feel about your contributions?

33. Looking back, how do the two quarters, Winter and Spring, of the Senior Seminar "hang together?"

34. As you see it at this point, what do you believe the goals/objectives of a Women's Studies Senior Seminar ought to be? What part do you think the Senior Seminar should play in the Women's Studies Program?

35. Please make any further evaluative comments or suggestions for improvement here.

Thank you again for all your help!

Table 20

Comments Regarding the Assigned Text by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

Item	N = 6 $\bar{x}$	SD	1 Not Appropriate		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How appropriate to the course was the book THE SECOND SEX by Simone deBeauvoir	4.8	.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	--	--
			1 Almost None		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
What insights did THE SECOND SEX provide for/into the ISSUES you dealt with in your project?	3.8	2.1	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	--	--	1	16.7	2	33.3	--	--

Further Comments	N = 6 f	%[a]		N = 6 f	%[a]
Didn't think much about connections	1	16.7	Not helpful for my project	1	16.7
Dualism and transcendence and immanence most important	1	16.7	Quite helpful for my project	1	16.7
Delineated condition of women	2	33.3	Interdisciplinary approach insightful	1	16.7

---

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 21

Comments Regarding Facilitating the Class Discussion of the Assigned Text by WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar", Spring 1977

	N = 6		1 Almost No Value		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
Item	$\bar{x}$	SD	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How much did FACILITATING CLASS DISCUSSIONS on THE SECOND SEX teach you about yourself	4.33	1.4	—	--	--	--	2	33.3	2	33.3	—	—	2	33.3	—	--

Further Comments	N = 6 f	%[a]
More open about time limitation; more flexible; less structured; cannot control discussion	4	66.7
Cannot control discussion	1	16.7
Team teaching is great; learned I can work in a group	2	33.3
Helped me feel more comfortable speaking	1	16.7
Team teaching takes time, compromise, power struggle, and not very comfortable	1	16.7
Learned what teachers go through in preparing	1	16.7
Not enough time available	1	16.7
Already know reactions/responses well	1	16.7

Comments from Students Written Evaluation of Own Performance As Discussion Leader	f	%[a]
I think I did a good job as discussion leader, well prepared	5	83.3
Not enough time to cover all	4	66.7
Would do it differently again	2	33.3
Discussion focused too much on personal issues	1	16.7
Angry that co-leader was irresponsible	1	16.7
Adequate -- nothing more	1	16.7

---

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 22

Comments Regarding the Project Advisor by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

Item	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	1 Almost None		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
				f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How much HELP did you DESIRE from your project advisor?	6	3.5	1.6	1	16.7	--	--	2	33.3	2	33.3	--	--	1	16.7	--	--
How often DID YOU SEEK out your advisor for HELP with your PROJECT?	6	2.5	1.4	2	33.3	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3	--	--	--	--	--	--
				1 Very Poor		2 Poor		3 Fair		4 Good		5 Very Good		6 Excellent		7 Exceptionally Good	
				f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How HELPFUL was your project ADVISOR?	5	5.2	.09	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	--	--

Table 23

Comments Regarding the Students' Own Oral Project Reports by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar", Spring 1977

	N = 6		1 Almost No Value		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
Item	$\bar{x}$	SD	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How valuable to you was your ORAL REPORT on your project:	5.3	1.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	f	16.7	3	50.0	1	16.7	1	16.7
How much did presenting an ORAL REPORT on your project teach you about yourself?	4.3	1.4	--	--	--	--	1	16.7	4	66.7	--	--	--	--	1	16.7

Further Comments	N = 6 f	%[a]		f	%[a]
Learned how easy to speak	2	33.3	I was devoted to it	1	16.7
Learned to organize material selectively	1	16.7	Fascinated by research	1	16.7
Learned to be relaxed in group	1	16.7	#1 strongpoint	1	16.7
Learned to develop less structured presentations and be comfortable	1	16.7	Would have preferred writing an extensive paper because too little time to present	1	16.7
Learned to manage A.V. equipment	1	16.7	Confirmed not good at public speaking; nervousness got in the way	1	16.7

---

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 24

Comments Regarding Other Students' Oral Project Reports

by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

Item	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	1 Almost Nothing		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
				f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
In GENERAL, what did you learn from the OTHER STUDENTS' ORAL PROJECT REPORTS?	4	5.2	1.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	25.0	2	50.0	--	--	1	25.0
In SPECIFIC, what did you learn form the ORAL PROJECT OF OTHER STUDENTS?																	
S. Anderson "Women's Emerging Spirituality"	5	5.0	1.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	40.0	--	--	2	40.0	1	20.0
A. Boerth "Prostitution"	3	5.7	.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	33.3	2	66.6	--	--
S. David "Child Birth"	5	4.8	.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	20.0	4	80.0	--	--	--	--
M. Dobson "Orlando (Virginia Woolf)"	5	3.2	.8	--	--	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
S. Goldberg "Wedding Industry"	3	2.7	1.2	--	--	2	66.6	--	--	1	33.3	--	--	--	--	--	--
J. Karpel "T.C. Women's Collectives"	5	3.8	1.5	--	--	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	--	--	1	20.0	--	--
K. Knutson "Female Juvenile Delinquents . . ."	4	5.5	1.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	50.0	2	50.0	--	--
K. MacKenzie "Elizabeth Blackwell's Women's Health Center"	5	5.4	1.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	40.0	1	20.0	--	--	2	40.0
G. Plewacki "Elizabeth Blackwell's Women's Health Center"	6	5.3	1.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	33.3	2	33.3	--	--	2	33.3
J. Van Kirk "Women's Music"	5	4.8	1.6	--	--	--	--	1	20.0	2	40.0	--	--	1	20.0	1	20.0

Table 25

Comments Regarding Project, Paper, Effort, and Value

by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

tem	N = 6 $\bar{x}$	SD	1 Almost No Value f	%	2 Very Little f	%	3 Little f	%	4 A Fair Amount f	%	5 Much f	%	6 Very Much f	%	7 An Exceptional Amount f	%
w valuable to you was ur WRITTEN PAPER on ur project?	5.83	1.8	--	--	1	16.7	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	33.3	3	50.0

			1 Almost None f	%	2 Very Little f	%	3 Little f	%	4 A Fair Amount f	%	5 Much f	%	6 Very Much f	%	7 An Exceptional Amount f	%
w much EFFORT did you ut into your PROJECT?	6.33	.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0

escribe what YOUR PROJECT verall offered of value to you.	N = 6 f	%[a]
Instilled in me a desire to fight for self and beliefs, deeper sense of feminism for combat	4	66.7
Helped me learn about more resources, facilities	2	33.3
Helped sway toward education/work endeavors	2	33.3
Helped know about feminist research	1	16.7
Personal growth	1	16.7
Taught me much	1	16.7
Have more healthy view of female-male relationships	1	16.7
Advice to keep open mind	1	16.7

hat seemed to be the GOALS/OBJECTIVES of doing a PROJECT or the course spring quarter? n what ways were these met and not met?	N = 6 f	%[a]	Met f	Partially Met f	Not Met f	No Response f
Do feminist research	3	50.0	1	1	--	1
Share knowledge with others	3	50.0	2	1	--	--
Explore subject for personal use.	2	33.3	2	--	--	--
Contribute to WoSt field	1	16.7	--	1	--	--
Continuation of WoSt work	1	16.7	1	--	--	--
Find varied resources	1	16.7	--	--	--	1
Get into project	1	16.7	1	--	--	--

---

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 26

Responses Regarding Certain Aspects of the Seminar by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

Item	N = 6 $\bar{x}$	SD	1 Very Strongly Disagree		2 Strongly Disagree		3 Disagree		4 Agree		5 Strongly Agree		6 Very Strongly Agree		7 Most Strongly Agree	
In General . . .			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
procedures for determining grades were appropriate for this course.	4.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	100.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
the amount of work required was appropriate for the number of credits required.	3.8	.75	--	--	--	--	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7	--	--	--	--
adequate information about how well I was doing was readily available.	4.3	1.1	--	--	--	--	1	16.7	3	50.0	1	16.7	1	16.7	--	--
my responsibilities in the course were clearly defined.	4.6	1.4	--	--	--	--	1	16.7	2	33.3	2	33.3	--	--	1	16.7
I felt I had adequate background for this course.	4.6	1.4	--	--	--	--	1	16.7	2	33.3	2	33.3	--	--	1	16.7
I would recommend this course to a friend.	4.3	1.5	--	--	--	--	2	33.3	2	33.3	1	16.7	--	--	1	16.7
			1 Disliked Intensely		2 Disliked Greatly		3 Disliked Somewhat		4 Liked Somewhat		5 Liked A Lot		6 Liked Very Much		7 Liked Exceptionally Wel	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How much did you like the FORMAT of the course (Spring quarter), forgetting about the instructors?	4.3	.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	66.7	2	33.3	--	--	--	--
			1 Almost Nothing		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How much would you say you LEARNED from the course (Spring quarter), forgetting about the instructors?	5.2	1.4	--	--	--	--	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3	1	16.7
How much EFFORT overall did you put into the course (Spring quarter)?	5.3	1.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	33.3	1	16.7	2	33.3	1	16.7

Table 27

Comments Regarding Factors Which Heightened and Diminished Student Motivation in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

	N = 6	
Item	f	%[a]
A. Factors Which HEIGHTENED MOTIVATION to Get into the Subject Matter		
Issues raised by project	3	50.0
deBeauvoir text	3	50.0
Interest in specific topics (power, women's films)	2	33.3
Issues raised in class	1	16.7
Presentation	1	16.7
Comments by advisor and instructors	1	16.7
Sense of responsibility	1	16.7
B. Factors which DIMINISHED MOTIVATION to Get into the Subject Matter		
deBeauvoir text -- took too much time; too difficult; needs more intensive and analytical study	5	83.3
Met seldom, hard to maintain continuity or feelings of closeness	3	50.0
Springtime	1	16.7
Preoccupation with bureaucratic matters of graduating	1	16.7
Too much work	1	16.7
Frustrating research process	1	16.7
Personal complications	1	16.7
Discussions too superficial	1	16.7
Too many teachers	1	16.7

---

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 28

Comments Regarding Factors Which Were Most Satisfying and Disappointing in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

Item	N = 6 f	 %[a]
A. Factors MOST SATISFYING About the Seminar Spring Quarter		
de Beauvoir text	3	50.0
Project	3	50.0
Discussion	1	16.7
Oral reports	1	16.7
Relating material to women	1	16.7
Different approaches and insights	1	16.7
Closeness among students and teachers	1	16.7
Meeting only once a week	1	16.7
Finishing course	1	16.7
B. Factors MOST DISAPPOINTING About the Seminar Spring Quarter		
Difficulty of deBeauvoir text	3	50.0
Not enough help/input from advisor and teachers	2	33.3
Lack of friendship or feeling of community	1	16.7
Amount of work	1	16.7
Feminist model we should conform to contradicts feminist ideal of options	1	16.7
Should have worked more in power	1	16.7
Nothing was disappointing	1	16.7

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 29

Comments Regarding Similarities/Differences from Other Students by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

Item	N = 6 f	 %[a]
SIMILARITIES		
WoSt courses, feminist background and sympathies; comraderie	3	50.0
More similarities, because shared reading and risk-taking and personal revelations	2	33.3
Sense of all being apart from many other people we encounter daily	1	16.7
closer emotionally	1	16.7
deBeauvoir text confusing to us	1	16.7
DIFFERENCES		
Differences in political orientation and interests, greater involvement in social activism	2	33.3
Others more sure of beliefs	1	16.7
Others more articulate in groups	1	16.7
Others have more well-defined career plans	1	16.7
Being older and less idealistic and more experienced	1	16.7
I felt left out as a lesbian	1	16.7

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 30

Comments Regarding Responsibility for Learning in and Contribution to the Seminar by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar", Spring 1977

	N = 6		1 Almost No Value		2 Very Little		3 Little		4 A Fair Amount		5 Much		6 Very Much		7 An Exceptional Amount	
Item	$\bar{x}$	SD	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
How would you rate Yourself as assuming RESPONSIBILITY for your OWN Learning in this seminar Spring quarter?	5.33	1.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	33.3	1	16.7	2	33.3	1	16.7
How would you rate Yourself as assuming RESPONSIBILITY for the learning of OTHERS in this seminar Spring quarter?	4.5	1.2	--	--	--	--	2	33.3	--	--	3	50.0	1	16.7	--	--

In what ways did you contribute to the Seminar Spring quarter?	N = 6 f	%
Discussion input	3	50.0
Always did reading and preparation	2	33.3
Attending class	2	33.3
Oral presentation	3	50.0
Questions and suggestions	1	16.7
Listening	1	16.7
Discussion leading	1	16.7
Enjoyed project	1	16.7
Helped others with their projects	1	16.7
Spent time and contemplation in this evaluation	1	16.7

How do you FEEL about your contributions?	N = 6 f	%
Good (but regretful of absences)	1	16.7
Very positive	1	16.7
Wish I'd put more into discussion	3	50.0
Good (about being discussion facilitator)	1	16.7
Good (job on presentation)	2	33.3

Table 31

Comments Regarding Relationship of Seminar to Other Courses Taken and Affect of the Seminar on Approach to Other Courses by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Seminar Seminar", Spring 1977

Item	N = 6	
	f	%[a]
RELATIONSHIP OF SEMINAR TO OTHER COURSES TAKEN		
Opportunity to work on senior project.	1	16.7
Real coordination with two other courses.	1	16.7
Related to other Women's Studies courses.	1	16.7
Drew on experiences of other disciplines.	1	16.7
Affected paper choice in another course.	1	16.7
Helped identify why I had trouble accepting a lot of what's taught in traditional courses.	1	16.7
Course rates poorly.	1	16.7
No comment.	1	16.7
AFFECT OF SEMINAR ON APPROACH TO OTHER COURSES		
More knowledge and awareness of methodologies, biases, values	3	50.0
Strengthened and refined my feminist perspective	1	16.7
De Beauvior enlightening in review of other disciplines	1	16.7
I get angry in non-Women's Studies courses because still teaching sexist rubbish	1	16.7

Table continued

Table 31 -- continued

Item	N = 6	
	f	%[a]
Very little.	1	16.7
No comment.	1	16.7

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 32

Comments Regarding Contribution of the Seminar to Their Education and Affect on Their Educational/Vocational Plans by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

Item	N = 6	
	f	%[a]
CONTRIBUTION OF SEMINAR TO STUDENTS EDUCATION		
Book useful; learned greatly, provided solid theoretical foundation, helped me to see how basic and pervasive sexism is	4	66.7
Valuable to practice using feminist perspective in research	2	33.3
First time for independent study and excellent--enough feedback	1	16.7
Project in interesting area	1	16.7
Opportunity and background to do research in different disciplines	1	16.7
Student reports informed me	1	16.7
AFFECT OF SEMINAR ON STUDENTS EDUCATIONAL/VOCATIONAL PLANS		
Plan to do graduate school with woman's focus	2	33.3
Stirred interest in working politically	1	16.7
Added impetus to do women's films	1	16.7
Reaffirmed desire to work for women in a feminist organization	1	16.7
Not vastly changed, but strengthened feminism and humanism	1	16.7
Didn't affect plans	2	33.3

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 33

Comments Regarding Continuity of Senior Seminar Over Winter and Spring Seminars by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar", Spring 1977

Item	N = 6 f	%[a]
LOOKING BACK, HOW DO THE TWO QUARTERS, WINTER AND SPRING, OF THE SENIOR SEMINAR "HANG TOGETHER"?		
Helpful for project, especially methodologies.	3	50.0
Illustrated use of disciplinary approach to feminist research.	2	33.3
Good interplay.	1	16.7
Better than Fall/Winter.	1	16.7
General continuity.	1	16.7
Same facilitators/students essential for cohesiveness.	2	33.3
Too academic and hard to relate to my life.	1	16.7
Topics far too broad.	1	16.7
Winter quarter difficult — like trying to bake bread after being given only half the recipe and a few ingredients.	1	16.7
Not well.	1	16.7

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total more than 100.

Table 34

Comments Regarding What the Goals/Objectives of the Senior Seminar Ought to Be by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

	N = 6	
Item	f	%[a]
WHAT GOALS/OBJECTIVES OF THE SENIOR SEMINAR OUGHT TO BE		
Help with career, life plans, dealing with society, graduate school	4	66.7
Concentration on feminism: philosophy, major, works	2	33.3
Promote sisterhood	1	16.7
Time for synthesizing/integrating/evaluating	1	16.7
Should entail active involvement in polictical activities of the Women's movement	1	16.7
Enable student to pursue something of interest and get credit for it	1	16.7
Varied expertise of instructors valuable	1	16.7
Help plan future seminars	1	16.7
Should be continued	1	16.7
Not really sure	1	16.7
Two quarters are enough	2	33.3
Could involve more group interaction	1	16.7

---

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total greater than 100.

Table 35

Further Evaluative Comments and Suggestions Regarding the Senior Seminar by Students in WoSt 3-900: "Senior Seminar," Spring 1977

Item	N = 6	
	f	%[a]
I'll miss continuity	1	16.7
Discussion in group dynamics made me more self-conscious and not so effective	1	16.7
Need more in-going information and feedback regarding progress	1	16.7
A theme for three quarters would have unified matters	1	16.7
Perhaps offer one quarter of this sequence in junior year	1	16.7
Needs less work or five credits	1	16.7
Didn't like team teaching: too disjointed and no harmony	1	16.7
Need to improve on interpersonal feelings	1	16.7
Didn't feel personally involved--too clique-ish	1	16.7
Maybe do one agreed-upon project with each individual going in-depth into one segment	1	16.7
No comment	2	33.3

[a] Categories are not independent; percentages may total more than 100.